arXiv:math/0301107v1 [math.FA] 10 Jan 2003

On the Bessmertnyĭ Class of Homogeneous Positive Holomorphic Functions of Several Variables

Dmitry S. Kalyuzhnyĭ-Verbovetzkiĭ

Abstract. The class of operator-valued functions which are homogeneous of degree one, holomorphic in the open right polyhalfplane, have positive semidefinite real parts there and take selfadjoint operator values at real points, and its subclass consisting of functions representable in the form of Schur complement of a block of a linear pencil of operators with positive semidefinite operator coefficients, are investigated. The latter subclass is a generalization of the class of characteristic matrix functions of passive 2n-poles considered as functions of impedances of its elements, which was introduced by M. F. Bessmertnyĭ. Several equivalent characterizations of the generalized Bessmertnyĭ class are given, and its intimate connection with the Agler–Schur class of holomorphic contractive operator-valued functions on the unit polydisk is established.

1. Introduction

In the Ph. D. Thesis of M. F. Bessmertnyĭ [9], which appeared in Russian about twenty years ago and until very recent time was unknown to Western readers (the translations of some its parts into English are appearing now: see [10, 7, 8]), rational $n \times n$ matrix-valued functions representable in the form

$$f(z) = a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^N, \tag{1.1}$$

with a linear $(n+p) \times (n+p)$ matrix-valued function

$$A(z) = A_0 + z_1 A_1 + \cdots + z_N A_N = \begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z) \end{bmatrix} \tag{1.2}$$

were considered. Another form of such a representation is

$$f(z) = \left(\begin{bmatrix} I_{n\times n} & 0_{n\times p} \end{bmatrix} A(z)^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n\times n} \\ 0_{p\times n} \end{bmatrix} \right)^{-1}, \tag{1.3}$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47A48; Secondary 32A10, 47A56, 47A60.

Key words and phrases. Operator-valued functions, several complex variables, homogeneous, positive, holomorphic, long resolvent representations, positive semidefinite kernels, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces.

and both (1.1) and (1.3) were called by Bessmertnyĭ a *long resolvent representation.* It is easy to see that this is nothing but the *Schur complement* of the block $d(z)$ in the linear matrix pencil $A(z)$. In [9] (see also [10]) Bessmertnyĭ constructed a long resolvent representation for an arbitrary rational matrix function, and in the homogeneous case, i.e., when

$$f(\lambda z_1, \ldots, \lambda z_N) = \lambda f(z_1, \ldots, z_N), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in \mathbb{C}^N, \tag{1.4}$$

one has $A_0 = 0$.

A particular role in his thesis is played by functions of the form (1.1) or (1.3) with $A_0 = 0$ and $A_k = A_k^T \geq 0,\ k = 1, \ldots, N$ (matrices A_k are assumed to have real entries), due to their relation to electrical circuits. He proved that such functions constitute the class (let us denote it by $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$) of characteristic matrix functions of passive 2n-poles, where impedances of elements (resistances, capacitances, inductances and ideal transformers are allowed) are considered as independent variables (let us note, that in the analytic theory of electrical circuits it is customary to consider characteristic matrices as functions of frequency, e.g., see [16, 19, 12, 17]). It is easy to verify that any $f \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ satisfies the following properties:

$$f(z) + f(z)^* \geq 0, \quad z \in \Pi^N, \tag{1.5}$$

where $\Pi^N := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N :\ \mathrm{Re} z_k > 0,\ k = 1, \ldots, N\}$ is the *open right polyhalfplane*, i.e., the Cartesian product of N copies of the open right half-plane $\Pi \subset \mathbb{C}$,

$$f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^* = f(\bar{z})^T, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^N, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\bar{z} := (\overline{z_1}, \ldots, \overline{z_N})$, together with property (1.4). Denote by $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ the class of rational *homogeneous positive real* $n \times n$ matrix functions, i.e., rational functions taking $n \times n$ matrix values and satisfying conditions (1.4)–(1.6). Then $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} \subset \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$. Let us remark that replacement of the requirement $A_k = A_k^T \geq 0$ by $A_k = A_K^* \geq 0,\ k = 1, \ldots, N$ (i.e., removing the assumption that positive semidefinite matrices A_k have only real entries), in the definition of $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$, and removing the second equality in condition (1.6) in the definition of $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ define the classes $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ and $\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{C}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, and $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} \subset \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$. It is clear that in the case $N = 1$ one has $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n} = \{f(z) = zA :\ \ A = A^T \geq 0\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n} = \{f(z) = zA :\ \ A = A^* \geq 0\}$, where $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and A is an $n \times n$ matrix with real (resp., complex) entries, thus this case is trivial. It was shown in [9] that in the case $N = 2$ one has $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, too (and we shall prove in the present paper that $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$). For $N \geq 3$ the question whether the inclusion $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} \subset \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ (as well as $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} \subset \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$) is proper, is still open.

Bessmertnyĭ constructed the long resolvent representations for the following special cases of functions from $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$:

- any $f \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_2^{n\times n}$;
- any rational scalar function $f = \frac{P}{Q} \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N$ with co-prime polynomials P and Q, where $\deg P = 2$ (see [9], and also [8]);

- any so-called *primary* rational matrix function $f = \frac{P}{Q} \in \mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, i.e., such that the matrix-valued polynomial P and the scalar polynomial Q are co-prime and of degree at most one with respect to each variable, and for each $j, k = 1, \dots, N$ there exist scalar polynomials $\varphi_{jk}, \psi_1^{(j)}(z), \dots, \psi_n^{(j)}(z)$ such that
$$\left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial z_j}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k} \left(\frac{Q}{\frac{\partial Q}{\partial z_j}}\right)(z) = \varphi_{jk}^2(z);$$
$$Q^2(z)\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^{(j)}(z) \\ \vdots \\ \psi_n^{(j)}(z) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \psi_1^{(j)}(z) & \dots & \psi_n^{(j)}(z) \end{bmatrix};$$
it was shown that f is primary if and only if there exists its long resolvent representation where coefficients $A_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$, of $A(z)$ in (1.2) are positive semidefinite (PSD) $(n + p) \times (n + p)$ matrices of rank one with real entries, and $A_0 = 0$ (see [9], and also [7]).

However, no any inner characterization of the class $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ appears in [9], i.e., Bessmertnyi's thesis doesn't give an idea how to distinguish functions from $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ which admit a long resolvent representation, except the cases mentioned above and those functions which arise as characteristic functions of certain concrete passive electrical 2n-poles.

The purpose of our paper is to give such a characterization. We succeed, however in a more general framework, which is quite natural. Firstly, we consider operator-valued functions instead of only matrix-valued ones. Secondly, we consider holomorphic functions instead of only rational ones. Thirdly, we permit infinite-dimensional long resolvent representations instead of only finite-dimensional ones.

We start with the "complex case", i.e., generalize the classes $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ and $\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{C}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$. In Section 2 we introduce the corresponding classes $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ of homogeneous positive holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions (throughout this paper $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ denotes the Banach space of bounded linear operators mapping a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$ into a Hilbert space $\mathcal{V}$, and $L(\mathcal{U}) := L(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$; all Hilbert spaces are supposed to be complex). We obtain the characterization of functions from the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (which we call the *Bessmertnyĭ class*) via a couple of identities which involve certain PSD kernels. In Section 3 we show that one of these identities turns under the Cayley transform over the variables into the Agler identity for holomorphic functions on the *unit polydisk* $\mathbb{D}^N := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^N :\ |z_k| < 1,\ k = 1, \dots, N\}$ taking operator values with PSD real parts. The latter means that the image of the $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ under the Cayley transform over the variables is a subclass in the Agler–Herglotz class $\mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$, introduced in [1]. Using the characterization of $\mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$ in terms of functional calculus of N-tuples of commuting strictly contractive linear operators on a Hilbert space, we obtain the characterization of $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ in terms of functional calculus of N-tuples of commuting bounded strictly accretive operators on a Hilbert space. In Section 4 we characterize the image of the Bessmertnyĭ class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ under the double Cayley transform ("double" means that this linear-fractional transform is applied to the variables and to the operator values, simultaneously), as a subclass in the Agler–Schur class $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$, also introduced in [1]. This characterization turns out to be pretty surprising: a function belongs to this subclass if and only if it is representable as a transfer function of an Agler unitary colligation for which the colligation operator is not only unitary, but also selfadjoint. In Section 5 we establish a natural one-to-one correspondence between $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (which consists of homogeneous functions of N variables) and certain class of (generically) non-homogeneous functions of $N-1$ variables. However, a special complicated structure of the latter class does rather convince us that $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ is more likeable to deal with. In Section 6 we turn to the "real" case. We introduce the notions of ι-real operator and ι-real operator-valued function for an anti-unitary involution $\iota=\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$ which plays a role analogous to the complex conjugation in $\mathbb{C}$, and then introduce the subclasses $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ in the classes $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, respectively, consisting of ι-real operator-valued functions. These subclasses generalize the classes $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ and $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, respectively. We adapt the results for the "complex case" of the preceding sections to this "real case", i.e., give the characterizations of $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ in terms of long resolvent representations, in terms of identities involving PSD kernels, in terms of Agler's unitary colligations and their transfer function representations for images of its elements under the double Cayley transform. In Section 7 we summarize the results obtained in this paper, and also formulate and briefly discuss the most important open problems arising in connection with our investigation.

2. The classes of homogeneous positive holomorphic functions

2.1.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a Hilbert space. Consider the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ consisting of all $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions f holomorphic in the domain $\Omega_N := \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\Pi)^N \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ (here for a fixed $\lambda\in\mathbb{T}$ a polyhalfplane $(\lambda\Pi)^N$ is the product of N copies of the half-plane $\lambda\Pi := \{\lambda z=(\lambda z_1,\dots,\lambda z_N):\ z\in\Pi^N\}$), such that the following conditions are satisfied:

$$f(\lambda z_1,\dots,z_N)=\lambda f(z_1,\dots,z_N),\quad \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z\in\Omega_N; \tag{2.1}$$

$$f(z)+f(z)^*\geq 0,\qquad z\in\Pi^N; \tag{2.2}$$

$$f(\bar{z})=f(z)^*,\qquad z\in\Omega_N. \tag{2.3}$$

Let us formulate and prove some geometrical properties of the domain Ω_N which appears naturally in this definition of the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, and the definition of the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ given subsequently (see Remark 2.5 below for the motivation), even though we will not use these properties explicitly in this paper.

Proposition 2.1. *The domain Ω_N has the following properties:*

- **(i):** *Ω_N is an (open)* **cone** *in $\mathbb{C}^N$, i.e., for each $z = (z_1, \dots, z_N) \in \Omega_N$ and any real $t > 0$ one has $tz = (tz_1, \dots, tz_N) \in \Omega_N$;*
- **(ii):** *Ω_N is a* **circular domain***, i.e., for each $z = (z_1, \dots, z_N) \in \Omega_N$ and any $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}^N$ one has $\lambda z = (\lambda z_1, \dots, \lambda z_N) \in \Omega_N$;*
- **(iii):** *for $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ one has clos$(\Omega_N) = \mathbb{C}^N$, and for $N \geq 3$ one has clos$(\Omega_N) \neq \mathbb{C}^N$;*
- **(iv):** *clos(Ω_N), as well as Ω_N, is not convex;*
- **(v):** *Ω_N is* **pseudo-convex** *(i.e., there exists a plurisubharmonic function on Ω_N, which tends to $+\infty$ as its variable point approaches to the boundary $\partial\Omega_N$); or equivalently,*
- **(vi):** *Ω_N is a* **holomorphy domain** *(i.e., there exists a holomorphic function on Ω_N, which is not holomorphically extendable to any bigger domain); or equivalently,*
- **(vii):** *Ω_N is* **not holomorphically extendable to any boundary point** *(i.e., for any point $a \in \partial\Omega_N$ there exist a neighborhood Γ of a, and a function which is holomorphic in $\Omega_N \cap \Gamma$ and not holomorphically extendable to a).*

For the proof of equivalence of properties **(v)**–**(vii)***, see* [21].

Proof. The properties (i) and (ii) are evident.

(iii). $N = 1$: $\text{clos}(\Omega_1) = \text{clos}(\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}) = \mathbb{C}$.

$N = 2$: for any $z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ there is a $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $z_1 \in \text{clos}(\lambda\Pi), z_2 \in \text{clos}(\lambda\Pi)$, thus $z = (z_1, z_2) \in (\text{clos}(\lambda\Pi))^2 \subset \text{clos}(\Omega_2)$, i.e., $\text{clos}(\Omega_2) = \mathbb{C}^2$.

$N \geq 3$: a point $z = (1, \exp(2\pi i/N), \dots, \exp(2\pi i(N-1)/N))$ doesn't belong, together with some neighborhood, to any open polyhalfplane, and therefore to Ω_N, thus $z \notin \text{clos}(\Omega_N)$.

(iv). Clearly, Ω_N is not convex because for any $z \in \Omega_N$ one has $-z \in \Omega_N$, and $\frac{z+(-z)}{2} = 0 \notin \Omega_N$.

Let us show that $\text{clos}(\Omega_N) = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$. Indeed, if $z \in (\lambda\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ then, clearly, $z \in \text{clos}(\Omega_N)$. Conversely, if $z \notin \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$ then for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ one has $\frac{z}{\lambda} = (\frac{z_1}{\lambda}, \dots, \frac{z_N}{\lambda}) \notin (\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$, moreover, there exist a neighborhood $\Gamma_\lambda \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ of z, and a neighborhood $\Delta_\lambda \subset \mathbb{C}$ of λ such that for any $z' \in \Gamma_\lambda$ and $\lambda' \in \Delta_\lambda$ one has $\frac{z'}{\lambda'} \notin (\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$. Since the collection of open sets $\{\Delta_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}$ is a covering of a compact set $\mathbb{T}$, one may choose its finite subcovering $\{\Delta_{\lambda_j}\}_{j=1}^m$. Set $\Gamma := \bigcap_{j=1}^m \Gamma_{\lambda_j}$. Then for any $z' \in \Gamma$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ one has $\frac{z'}{\lambda} \notin (\text{clos}(\Pi))^N$, i.e., $\Gamma \cap (\lambda\text{clos}(\Pi))^N = \emptyset$. Thus, $\Gamma \cap \Omega_N = \emptyset$, i.e., $z \notin \text{clos}(\Omega_N)$.

A point $z = (1, \exp(2\pi i/N), \dots, \exp(2\pi i(N-1)/N)) \notin \text{clos}(\Omega_N)$ can be expressed as $z = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^N z^{(k)}$, where

$$z^{(k)} = (0, \dots, 0, \underbrace{N\exp(2\pi i(k-1)/N)}_{k-\text{th place}}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\text{clos}(\Pi))^N = \text{clos}(\Omega_N),$$

thus the set $\text{clos}(\Omega_N)$ is not convex.

(vii). First of all, let us show that the boundary points of Ω_N can be of two different types:

1. $z^\circ = (z_1^\circ, \dots, z_{j-1}^\circ, 0, z_{j+1}^\circ, \dots, z_N^\circ)$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, where ${z_j^\circ}' := (z_1^\circ, \dots, z_{j-1}^\circ, z_{j+1}^\circ, \dots, z_N^\circ) \in \mathrm{clos}(\Omega_{N-1})$;
2. $z^\circ = (z_1^\circ, \dots, z_N^\circ) \in \mathbb{C}^N$ such that $z_k^\circ \neq 0$ for all $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, and there exist $l, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $l < j$, and $t > 0$ for which $z_l^\circ + tz_j^\circ = 0$ and ${z_{lj}^\circ}'' := (z_1^\circ, \dots, z_{l-1}^\circ, z_{l+1}^\circ, \dots, z_{j-1}^\circ, z_{j+1}^\circ, \dots, z_N^\circ) \in (e^{i \arg z_l^\circ} \mathrm{clos}(\Pi))^{N-2}$ (or $\in (e^{-i \arg z_l^\circ} \mathrm{clos}(\Pi))^{N-2}$).

It is clear that points of these two types are boundary for Ω_N. Assume $z^\circ \in \partial\Omega_N$ is neither of these types. Then $z^\circ \in (\lambda \mathrm{clos}(\Pi))^N$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, moreover $z_{j_\mu} \in \partial(\lambda\Pi)$, $\mu = 1, \dots, s$, for some $j_1, \dots, j_s \in \{1, \dots, N\}$,

$$\arg z_{j_1} = \ldots = \arg z_{j_s} = \arg\lambda + \frac{\pi}{2} \ \left(\text{or } = \arg\lambda - \frac{\pi}{2}\right),$$

and $z_k \in (\lambda\Pi)$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, N\} \backslash \{j_1, \dots, j_s\}$. In this case, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $z^\circ \in (\lambda e^{i\varepsilon}\Pi)^N$ (resp., $z^\circ \in (\lambda e^{-i\varepsilon}\Pi)^N$), i.e., z° is an inner point of Ω_N, that contradicts to our assumption.

Let Γ be a neighborhood of a point z° of type 1. Set $f(z) := \frac{1}{z_j}$. Since for all points of Ω_N one has $z_j \neq 0$, f is holomorphic in $\Omega_N \cap \Gamma$, and not holomorphically extendable to z°.

Let Γ be a neighborhood of a point z° of type 2. Set $f(z) := \frac{1}{z_l + tz_j}$. Since for all points of Ω_N one has $z_l + tz_j \neq 0$, f is holomorphic in $\Omega_N \cap \Gamma$, and not holomorphically extendable to z°.

The proof is complete. □

An equivalent definition of the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ will be given below. For that let us prove, first of all, the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *Let a scalar-valued function f be holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ and satisfy $f(i^n\Pi) \subset i^n\Pi$ for $n = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Then f(z)=αz, $z \in \mathbb{C}$, with some number $\alpha > 0$.*

Proof. Set $h(z) := \frac{f(z)}{z}$. From the assumptions of this lemma it follows that h doesn't take values in the negative real semi-axis. Hence, the function $g(z) := \sqrt{h(z)}$ (with the principal branch of the square root) is well defined and holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$, and $g(\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}) \subset \Pi$. Since for any number w in the open left half-plane there is no sequence z_j such that $\lim_{j\to\infty} z_j = 0$ and $\lim_{j\to\infty} g(z_j) = w$, the point $z = 0$ can not be essentially singular for g (by the Sokhotsky theorem, see e.g. [20]). Hence, this point is not essentially singular for h, too. But $z = 0$ can not be a pole of h, since in this case $\arg h(z)$ would take all values from $[-\pi, \pi)$, including the value $-\pi$, which is banned. Thus, h has a removable singularity at $z = 0$.

Now consider the function $\widetilde{h}(z) := h(\frac{1}{z}) = zf(\frac{1}{z})$. This function is holomorphic on $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$, and also doesn't take values in the negative real semi-axis. Applying the same reasoning, we obtain that $\widetilde{h}$ has a removable singularity at $z = 0$, and therefore h has a removable singularity at infinity. Finally, we have got the entire function h which has no singularity at infinity. Thus, by the Liouville theorem, h is a constant. Therefore, $f(z) = \alpha z$, and since $f(\Pi) = \alpha\Pi \subset \Pi$, we get $\alpha > 0$. □

Corollary 2.3. *For an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function f holomorphic on the domain Ω_N, conditions (2.1) and (2.2) together are equivalent to the following set of conditions:*

$$\begin{array}{rr} f(z)+f(z)^*\geq 0, & z\in\Pi^N, \\ f(z)+f(z)^*\leq 0, & z\in(-\Pi)^N, \\ i(f(z)^*-f(z))\geq 0, & z\in(i\Pi)^N, \\ i(f(z)^*-f(z))\leq 0, & z\in(-i\Pi)^N. \end{array} \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. If conditions (2.1) and (2.2) are fulfilled, then (2.4) follows immediately. Conversely, let conditions (2.4) are fulfilled. Consider for each fixed $x\in\Pi^N\cap\mathbb{R}^N$ the cut-function $\varphi_x(\lambda):=f(\lambda x_1,\dots,\lambda x_N),\ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$, and for each fixed $x\in\Pi^N\cap\mathbb{R}^N,\ u\in\mathcal{U}$ the function $\psi_{x,u}(\lambda)=\langle\varphi_x(\lambda)u,u\rangle,\ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. If $\psi_{x,u}(\lambda)\equiv 0$ set $\alpha_{x,u}:=0$. If $\psi_{x,u}(\lambda)\not\equiv 0$ then $\psi_{x,u}$ satisfies the conditions of Lemma 2.2. Thus, $\psi_{x,u}(\lambda)=\alpha_{x,u}\lambda,\ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ for some number $\alpha_{x,u}>0$. Since $\psi_{x,u}(1)=\alpha_{x,u}=\langle f(x)u,u\rangle$, one has $\psi_{x,u}(\lambda)=\langle\varphi_x(\lambda)u,u\rangle=\langle f(x)u,u\rangle\lambda$ for any fixed $x\in\Pi^N\cap\mathbb{R}^N,\ u\in\mathcal{U}$. Therefore, $\varphi_x(\lambda)=\lambda f(x)$, i.e., $f(\lambda x_1,\dots,\lambda x_N)=\lambda f(x_1,\dots,x_N),\ \lambda\in\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ for any $x\in\Pi^N\cap\mathbb{R}^N$. By the uniqueness theorem for holomorphic functions of several variables (see, e.g., [21]), we obtain (2.1). Since (2.2) is contained in the set of conditions (2.4), the proof is complete. □

Finally, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 2.4. *An $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued holomorphic function f on Ω_N belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if conditions (2.4) and (2.3) are satisfied.*

2.2.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a Hilbert space. Define the *Bessmertnyĭ class* $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ as a class of $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions f holomorphic on the domain Ω_N and representable in the form

$$f(z)=a(z)-b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z),\quad z\in\Omega_N, \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$A(z)=z_1A_1+\dots+z_NA_N=\begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z)\end{bmatrix}\in L(\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}),\quad z\in\Omega_N, \tag{2.6}$$

for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and bounded linear operators $A_k=A_k^*,\ k=1,\dots,N$, on $\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}$ are PSD. It is clear that $c(z)=\widetilde{b}(z):=b(\overline{z})^*$, i.e., $z_1c_1+\dots+z_Nc_N=z_1b_1^*+\dots+z_Nb_N^*,\ z\in\Omega_N$, and linear pencils $a(z)=z_1a_1+\dots+z_Na_N=\widetilde{a}(z),\ d(z)=z_1d_1+\dots+z_Nd_N=\widetilde{d}(z)$ have PSD coefficients $a_k=a_k^*,\ d_k=d_k^*,\ k=1,\dots,N$, from $L(\mathcal{U})$ and $L(\mathcal{H})$, respectively. For a function $f\in\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ it is easy to check properties (2.1)–(2.3), thus $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})\subset\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Remark 2.5. If a function f is holomorphic on Π^N and has the representation (2.5) there, then f can be extended to Ω_N by homogeneity of degree one, and this extension is, clearly, holomorphic and has a representation (2.5) in Ω_N. That is why we define the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ straight away as a class of functions on Ω_N.

Keeping in mind the possibility and uniqueness of such extension, we will write sometimes $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ for functions defined originally on Π^N.

Remark 2.6. If $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $f(z)$ is boundedly invertible in Π^N (and hence in Ω_N) then (2.5) can be rewritten in the form

$$f(z) = \left(P_{\mathcal{U}} A(z)^{-1}|\mathcal{U}\right)^{-1}, \quad z \in \Omega_N, \tag{2.7}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{U}}$ is the orthogonal projector onto $\mathcal{U}$ in $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, and $A(z)$ is given by (2.6). This follows from the equality

$$\begin{bmatrix} a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z) & 0 \\ 0 & d(z) \end{bmatrix} =$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} & -b(z)d(z)^{-1} \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} & 0 \\ -d(z)^{-1}c(z) & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.8}$$

Let Ω be a set. Recall that an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function Φ on $\Omega \times \Omega$ is called a *Hermitian symmetric positive semidefinite kernel* (or, for the shortness, a *PSD kernel*) if

$$\Phi(z, \zeta) = \Phi(\zeta, z)^*, \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Omega \times \Omega, \tag{2.9}$$

and for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{z^{(\mu)}\}_{\mu=1}^m \subset \Omega$, $\{u^{(\mu)}\}_{\mu=1}^m \subset \mathcal{U}$ one has

$$\sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \Phi(z^{(\mu)}, z^{(\nu)}) u^{(\mu)}, u^{(\nu)} \rangle \geq 0. \tag{2.10}$$

If Ω is a domain in $\mathbb{C}^N$ and a PSD kernel $\Phi(z, \zeta)$ on $\Omega \times \Omega$ is holomorphic in z and anti-holomorphic in ζ, then $\Phi(z, \zeta)$ is said to be a *holomorphic PSD kernel on* $\Omega \times \Omega$ (not to be confused with a holomorphic function on $\Omega \times \Omega$).

Theorem 2.7. *Let f be an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function holomorphic on Π^N. Then $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if there exist holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z, \zeta)$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, on $\Pi^N \times \Pi^N$ such that*

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^N z_k \Phi_k(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N, \tag{2.11}$$

holds. In this case the kernels $\Phi_k(z, \zeta)$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, can be uniquely extended to the holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Omega_N \times \Omega_N$ (we denote the extended kernels by the same letters) which are homogeneous of degree zero, i.e., for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \backslash \{0\}$

$$\Phi_k(\lambda z, \lambda \zeta) = \Phi_k(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N, \tag{2.12}$$

and identity (2.11) is extended to all $(z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N$.

Proof. **Necessity.** This part of the theorem was proved by Bessmertnyĭ in [9] (see also [10]) for rational matrix-valued functions f by playing with a long resolvent representation of f in the form (1.3). We follow the same idea, however we use in our proof the representation (2.5), which does exist for our case without an additional assumption on the invertibility of $f(z)$ (see Remark 2.6).

Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Then (2.5) holds for some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and linear pencil of operators $A(z)$ of the form (2.6). Define

$$\psi(z) := \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ -d(z)^{-1}c(z) \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{H}), \quad z \in \Omega_N.$$

Then for all $(z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z) \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} & -c(\zeta)^* d(\zeta)^{*-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z) \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} & -c(\zeta)^* d(\zeta)^{*-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ -d(z)^{-1}c(z) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \psi(\zeta)^* A(z) \psi(z). \end{aligned}$$

Set $\Phi_k(z, \zeta) := \psi(\zeta)^* A_k \psi(z), \ k = 1, \dots, N$. Clearly, functions $\Phi_k(z, \zeta), \ k = 1, \dots, N$, satisfy properties (2.9) and (2.10) for $\Omega = \Omega_N$. Since ψ is holomorphic on Ω_N we obtain that $\Phi_k(z, \zeta), \ k = 1, \dots, N$, are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Omega_N \times \Omega_N$. Rewriting the equality

$$f(z) = \psi(\zeta)^* A(z) \psi(z), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N,$$

in the form

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} z_k \Phi_k(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N, \tag{2.13}$$

we obtain, in particular, (2.11).

Sufficiency. Let us note that the assumption that a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ involved implicitly in the representation (2.5) can be infinite-dimensional, is essential in our proof of this part of the theorem (Bessmertnyĭ proved only the necessity part, under his assumptions).

Let f be an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function holomorphic on Π^N and representable there in the form (2.11) with some holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z, \zeta), \ k = 1, \dots, N$. For these kernels there exist auxiliary Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{M}_k$ and holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions φ_k on Π^N such that $\Phi_k(z, \zeta) = \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z), \ (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$ (see [4]). Set $\mathcal{M} := \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{M}_k, \ P_k := P_{\mathcal{M}_k}, \ \varphi(z) := \operatorname{col} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_1(z) & \dots & \varphi_N(z) \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}), \ e := (1, \dots, 1) \in \Pi^N$. ¿From (2.11) we get

$$f(e) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(e), \quad \zeta \in \Pi^N. \tag{2.14}$$

In particular,

$$f(e) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} \varphi_k(e)^* \varphi_k(e). \tag{2.15}$$

By subtracting (2.15) from (2.14) we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N}[\varphi_k(\zeta)-\varphi_k(e)]^*\varphi_k(e)=0,\quad \zeta\in\Pi^N,$$

i.e., the following orthogonality relation holds:

$$\mathcal{H}:=\text{clos span}_{\zeta\in\Pi^N}\{[\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)]\mathcal{U}\}\perp\text{clos}\{\varphi(e)\mathcal{U}\}=:\mathcal{X}.$$

For any $\zeta\in\Pi^N$ and $u\in\mathcal{U}$ one can represent now $\varphi(\zeta)u$ as

$$\text{col}\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e) & \varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)\end{bmatrix}u\in\mathcal{X}\oplus\mathcal{H}.$$

On the other hand, for any $u\in\mathcal{U},\ \zeta\in\Pi^N$ one has

$$\varphi(e)u\in\text{clos span}_{\zeta\in\Pi^N}\{\varphi(\zeta)\mathcal{U}\},\quad [\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)]u\in\text{clos span}_{\zeta\in\Pi^N}\{\varphi(\zeta)\mathcal{U}\}.$$

Thus, $\text{clos span}_{\zeta\in\Pi^N}\{\varphi(\zeta)\mathcal{U}\}=\mathcal{X}\oplus\mathcal{H}$. Let $\kappa:\mathcal{X}\oplus\mathcal{H}\longrightarrow\mathcal{M}$ be the natural embedding defined by

$$\kappa:\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e)u\\(\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e))u\end{bmatrix}\longmapsto\varphi(\zeta)u=\begin{bmatrix}\varphi_1(\zeta)u\\\vdots\\\varphi_N(\zeta)u\end{bmatrix},\quad\zeta\in\Pi^N,\ u\in\mathcal{U},\tag{2.16}$$

and extended to the whole $\mathcal{X}\oplus\mathcal{H}$ by linearity and continuity. Set

$$A_k:=\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e)^* & 0\\0 & I_{\mathcal{H}}\end{bmatrix}\kappa^*P_k\kappa\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e) & 0\\0 & I_{\mathcal{H}}\end{bmatrix}\in L(\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}),\quad k=1,\dots,N.$$

Clearly, $A_k=A_k^*$ are PSD operators. Set

$$\psi(\zeta):=\begin{bmatrix}I_{\mathcal{U}}\\\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)\end{bmatrix}\in L(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}),\quad\zeta\in\Pi^N.$$

Then $f(z)=\psi(\zeta)^*A(z)\psi(z),\ (z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$. Indeed,

$$\psi(\zeta)^*A(z)\psi(z)=$$

$$\begin{bmatrix}I_{\mathcal{U}}\\\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)\end{bmatrix}^*\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e) & 0\\0 & I_{\mathcal{H}}\end{bmatrix}^*\kappa^*\left(\sum_{k=1}^{N}z_kP_k\right)\kappa\begin{bmatrix}\varphi(e) & 0\\0 & I_{\mathcal{H}}\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}I_{\mathcal{U}}\\\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)\end{bmatrix}$$

$$=\sum_{k=1}^{N}z_k\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z)=f(z).$$

Now, let $A_k,\ k=1,\dots,N$, have the block partitioning:

$$A_k=\begin{bmatrix}a_k & b_k\\c_k & d_k\end{bmatrix}\in L(\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}).$$

Then

$$A(z)\psi(z)=\begin{bmatrix}a(z) & b(z)\\c(z) & d(z)\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}I_{\mathcal{U}}\\\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)\end{bmatrix}=$$

$$\begin{bmatrix}a(z)+b(z)(\varphi(z)-\varphi(e))\\c(z)+d(z)(\varphi(z)-\varphi(e))\end{bmatrix}=:\begin{bmatrix}f_1(z)\\f_2(z)\end{bmatrix}.$$

Since for any $(z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$ one has

$$\psi(\zeta)^*A(z)\psi(z)=\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} & \varphi(\zeta)^*-\varphi(e)^*\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} f_1(z)\\ f_2(z)\end{bmatrix}=f(z),$$

by setting $\zeta:=e$ in this equality we get $f_1(z)=f(z),\ z\in\Pi^N$. Therefore, for any $(z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$ one has $[\varphi(\zeta)-\varphi(e)]^*f_2(z)=0$. This implies that for any $z\in\Pi^N$ and $u\in\mathcal{U}$ one has $f_2(z)u\perp\mathcal{H}$. But $f_2(z)u\in\mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $f_2(z)u=0$, and $f_2(z)\equiv 0$, i.e.,

$$c(z)+d(z)[\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)]\equiv 0. \tag{2.17}$$

Since for any $z\in\Pi^N$ the operator $P(z):=\sum_{k=1}^N z_kP_k$ has positive definite real part, the operator $d(z)=P_{\mathcal{H}}\kappa^*P(z)\kappa|\mathcal{H}$ has positive definite real part, too. Therefore, $d(z)$ is boundedly invertible for all $z\in\Pi^N$. From (2.17) we get $\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)=-d(z)^{-1}c(z),\ z\in\Pi^N$, and

$$f(z)=f_1(z)=a(z)-b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z),\quad z\in\Pi^N.$$

Taking into account Remark 2.5, we get $f\in\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Since $\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)=-d(z)^{-1}c(z)$ and, hence, $\psi(z)$ are well-defined, holomorphic and homogeneous of degree zero functions on Ω_N, the kernels $\Phi_k(z,\zeta)=\psi(\zeta)^*A_k\psi(z),\ k=1,\dots,N$, are extended to $\Omega_N\times\Omega_N$, and (2.12) holds. One can easily verify that these extended functions are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Omega_N\times\Omega_N$, and (2.13) holds. The proof is complete. □

3. The class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and functional calculus

In this section we will give a characterization of the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ via the functional calculus of N-tuples of commuting bounded strictly accretive operators. First of all, let us observe that the identity (2.11) is equivalent to the pair of the following identities:

$$f(z)+f(\zeta)^*=\sum_{k=1}^N(z_k+\overline{\zeta_k})\Phi_k(z,\zeta),\quad (z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N, \tag{3.1}$$

$$f(z)-f(\zeta)^*=\sum_{k=1}^N(z_k-\overline{\zeta_k})\Phi_k(z,\zeta),\quad (z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N. \tag{3.2}$$

We will show that the Cayley transform over all the variables turns the first of these identities into Agler's identity which characterizes the Agler–Herglotz class of holomorphic functions on the unit polydisk $\mathbb{D}^N$. The latter has also, due to [1], another characterization, via the functional calculus of N-tuples of commuting strict contractions, that will give us the desired result for the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Let us recall the necessary definitions. Denote by $\mathcal{C}^N$ the set of all N-tuples $\mathbf{T}=(T_1,\dots,T_N)$ of commuting linear operators on some common Hilbert space

$\mathcal{H}$ subject to the condition $\|T_k\| < 1,\ k = 1, \ldots, N$ (*strict contractions*). Then for any holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function

$$F(w) = \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{F}_t w^t, \quad w \in \mathbb{D}^N$$

(here $\mathbb{Z}_+^N := \{t \in \mathbb{Z}^N : \ t_k \geq 0, k = 1, \ldots, N\}$ and $w^t := \prod_{k=1}^N w_k^{t_k}$), and any $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{C}^N$ the operator

$$F(\mathbf{T}) := \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{F}_t \otimes \mathbf{T}^t \in L(\mathcal{U} \otimes \mathcal{H}) \tag{3.3}$$

is well-defined as a sum of a series convergent in the operator norm. The *Agler-Herglotz* class $\mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$ consists of all $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions F which are holomorphic on $\mathbb{D}^N$ and satisfying the condition

$$F(\mathbf{T}) + F(\mathbf{T})^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{C}^N, \tag{3.4}$$

where the inequality "$\geq$" is considered in the sense of positive semi-definiteness of a selfadjoint operator. It was proved in [1] that $F \in \mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if there exist holomorphic PSD kernels $\Xi_k(w, \omega),\ k = 1, \ldots, N$, on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$ such that

$$F(w) + F(\omega)^* = \sum_{k=1}^{N} (1 - \overline{\omega_k} w_k) \Xi_k(w, \omega), \quad (w, \omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N. \tag{3.5}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{A}^N$ the set of all N-tuples $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \ldots, R_N)$ of commuting bounded linear operators on some common Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ for which there exists a real constant $s > 0$ such that $R_k + R_k^* \geq sI_{\mathcal{H}},\ k = 1, \ldots, N$ (*strictly accretive operators*). The *operator Cayley transform*, defined by

$$R_k := (I_{\mathcal{H}} + T_k)(I_{\mathcal{H}} - T_k)^{-1}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{3.6}$$

maps the set $\mathcal{C}^N$ onto $\mathcal{A}^N$, and its inverse

$$T_k := (R_k - I_{\mathcal{H}})(R_k + I_{\mathcal{H}})^{-1}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{3.7}$$

maps $\mathcal{A}^N$ onto $\mathcal{C}^N$.

Let f be an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function holomorphic on Π^N. Then the *Cayley transform over variables* applied to f gives

$$F(w) := f\left(\frac{1 + w_1}{1 - w_1}, \ldots, \frac{1 + w_N}{1 - w_N}\right), \quad w \in \mathbb{D}^N, \tag{3.8}$$

which is a holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function on $\mathbb{D}^N$.

For any $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$ let us define $f(\mathbf{R}) := F(\mathbf{T})$ where $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \ldots, T_N)$ is defined by (3.7).

Theorem 3.1. *Let f be an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function holomorphic on Π^N. Then $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(i): $f(tz_1, \ldots, tz_N) = tf(z_1, \ldots, z_N), \quad t > 0,\ z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in \Pi^N$;

(ii): $f(\mathbf{R}) + f(\mathbf{R})^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$;

(iii): $f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^*, \quad z \in \Pi^N$.

Proof. **Necessity.** Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Then (i) and (iii) easily follow from the representation (2.5) of f. Condition (ii) on f is equivalent to condition (3.4) on F which is defined by (3.8), i.e., to $F \in \mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Let us show the latter. Since f satisfies (3.1), one can set $z_k := \frac{1+w_k}{1-w_k},\ \zeta_k = \frac{1+\omega_k}{1-\omega_k},\ k = 1, \dots, N$, in (3.1) and get

$$\begin{aligned} &F(w) + F(\omega)^* = \\ &\quad \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\frac{1+w_k}{1-w_k} + \frac{1+\overline{\omega_k}}{1-\overline{\omega_k}} \right) \Phi_k \left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1}, \dots, \frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N}; \frac{1+\omega_1}{1-\omega_1}, \dots, \frac{1+\omega_N}{1-\omega_N} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} (1 - \overline{\omega_k} w_k) \Xi_k(w, \omega), \quad (w, \omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N, \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

where for $k = 1, \dots, N$:

$$\Xi_k(w, \omega) = \frac{2}{(1-w_k)(1-\overline{\omega_k})} \Phi_k \left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1}, \dots, \frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N}; \frac{1+\omega_1}{1-\omega_1}, \dots, \frac{1+\omega_N}{1-\omega_N} \right). \tag{3.10}$$

Since for each $k = 1, \dots, N$ one has $\Phi_k(z, \zeta) = \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z),\ (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$, where φ_k is a holomorphic function on Π^N with values in $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$ for an auxiliary Hilbert space $\mathcal{M}_k$ (again, see [4]), we get $\Xi_k(w, \omega) = \xi_k(\omega)^* \xi_k(w),\ (w, \omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, where

$$\xi_k(w) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{1-w_k} \varphi_k \left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1}, \dots, \frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N} \right), \tag{3.11}$$

are holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$. Thus, $\Xi_k(w, \omega),\ k = 1, \dots, N$, are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, and (3.9) means that $F \in \mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Sufficiency. Let f satisfy conditions (i)–(iii). Since (ii) is equivalent to $F \in \mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$, where F is defined by (3.8), the identity (3.5) holds with holomorphic PSD kernels $\Xi_k(w, \omega)$ on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$. Let $\Xi_k(w, \omega) = \xi_k(\omega)^* \xi_k(w),\ (w, \omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, where ξ_k are holomorphic functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$ taking values in $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$ for some auxiliary Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{M}_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$. Set $w_k := \frac{z_k - 1}{z_k + 1},\ \omega_k = \frac{\xi_k - 1}{\xi_k + 1},\ k = 1, \dots, N$, in (3.5), and by virtue of (3.8) get:

$$\begin{aligned} &f(z) + f(\zeta)^* = \\ &\quad \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(1 - \frac{\overline{\zeta_k} - 1}{\overline{\zeta_k} + 1} \cdot \frac{z_k - 1}{z_k + 1} \right) \xi_k \left(\frac{\zeta_1 - 1}{\zeta_1 + 1}, \dots, \frac{\zeta_N - 1}{\zeta_N + 1} \right)^* \xi_k \left(\frac{z_1 - 1}{z_1 + 1}, \dots, \frac{z_N - 1}{z_N + 1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} (z_k + \overline{\zeta_k}) \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N, \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where for $k = 1, \dots, N$

$$\varphi_k(z) := \frac{\sqrt{2}}{z_k + 1} \xi_k \left(\frac{z_1 - 1}{z_1 + 1}, \dots, \frac{z_N - 1}{z_N + 1} \right) \tag{3.13}$$

are holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions on Π^N. It follows that $\Phi_k(z, \zeta) := \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z),\ k = 1, \dots, N$, are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Pi^N \times \Pi^N$, and (3.1) holds. The property (iii) implies $f(x) = f(x)^*$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \cap \Pi^N$, and for any such x, and $t > 0$ by (3.12) one has:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) + f(tx) &= (1+t) \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(x), \\ f(tx) + f(x) &= (1+t) \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(tx), \\ \frac{1+t}{2}[f(x) + f(x)] &= \frac{1+t}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{N} 2x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(x), \\ \frac{1+t}{2t}[f(tx) + f(tx)] &= \frac{1+t}{2t} \sum_{k=1}^{N} 2tx_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(tx). \end{aligned}$$

By (i), the left-hand sides of these equalities coincide and equal to $(1+t)f(x)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(tx) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(tx). \end{aligned}$$

¿From here we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\le \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k [\varphi_k(tx) - \varphi_k(x)]^* [\varphi_k(tx) - \varphi_k(x)] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(tx) - \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(tx)^* \varphi_k(x) \\ &- \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(tx) + \sum_{k=1}^{N} x_k \varphi_k(x)^* \varphi_k(x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\varphi_k(tx) - \varphi_k(x) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^N \cap \Pi^N,\ t > 0$ and $k = 1, \dots, N$. For fixed $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $t > 0$ the function $h_{k,t}(z) := \varphi_k(tz) - \varphi_k(z)$ is holomorphic on Π^N and takes values in $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$. Then for any fixed $k \in \{1, \dots, N\},\ t > 0,\ u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}_k$ the scalar function $h_{k,t,u,m}(z) := \langle h_{k,t}(z)u, m \rangle_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ is holomorphic on Π^N and vanishes on $\mathbb{R}^N \cap \Pi^N$. By the uniqueness theorem for holomorphic functions of several variables (see, e.g., [21]), $h_{k,t,u,m}(z) \equiv 0$, hence $h_{k,t}(z) \equiv 0$, that means:

$$\varphi_k(tz) = \varphi_k(z), \quad t > 0,\ z \in \Pi^N.$$

It follows from here that for any $(z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$ and $t > 0$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) + tf(\zeta)^* &= f(z) + f(t\zeta)^* = \sum_{k=1}^{N} (z_k + t\overline{\zeta_k})\varphi_k(t\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} (z_k + t\overline{\zeta_k})\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} z_k\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z) + t\sum_{k=1}^{N} \overline{\zeta_k}\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z), \end{aligned}$$

and the comparison of the coefficients of the two linear functions in t, in the beginning and in the end of this chain of equalities, gives:

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} z_k\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N,$$

i.e., (2.11). By Theorem 2.7, $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. The proof is complete. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let f be an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function holomorphic on Ω_N. Then $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- **(i):** $f(\lambda z_1, \ldots, \lambda z_N) = \lambda f(z_1, \ldots, z_N), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in \Omega_N$;
- **(ii):** $f(\mathbf{R}) + f(\mathbf{R})^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$;
- **(iii):** $f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^*, \quad z \in \Omega_N$.

Proof. If $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ then conditions (i) and (iii) follow from the representation (2.5) of f, and condition (ii) follows from Theorem 3.1. Conversely, conditions (i)–(iii) of this Corollary imply conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 3.1, which in turn imply $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. □

Remark 3.3. By Corollary 3.2, its conditions (i)–(iii) on holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions on Ω_N give an equivalent definition of the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, which seems to be more natural than the original definition given in Section 2 in "existence" terms. The definition of the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ is obtained by replacing condition (ii) by a weaker condition (2.2).

4. The image of the Bessmertnyĭ class under the double Cayley transform

In Section 3 it was established that the Cayley transform over the variables maps the Bessmertnyĭ class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ into the Agler–Herglotz class $\mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Since the Cayley transform over the values of functions maps the class $\mathcal{AH}_N(\mathcal{U})$ into the Agler–Schur class $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (see [1]), the composition of these two transforms (the *double Cayley transform*) maps $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ into $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$. The class $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$ is important in the interpolation theory and systems theory in several variables (see, e.g., [1, 2, 6, 14, 15, 5]), that is why it is interesting to describe the image of $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ in $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$ under the double Cayley transform.

Given $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, define for $w \in \mathbb{D}^N$:

$$\mathcal{F}(w) = (F(w) - I_{\mathcal{U}})(F(w) + I_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} =$$

$$\left(f\left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1}, \ldots, \frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N}\right) - I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\left(f\left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1}, \ldots, \frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N}\right) + I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}. \tag{4.1}$$

We shall write down $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$, and call $\mathcal{C}(\cdot)$ the *double Cayley transform.*

Let us recall the definition, and resume the main results of [1] on the Agler–Schur class $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function on $\mathbb{D}^N$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(i): $\|\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{T})\| \le 1$ *for any* $\mathbf{T} \in \mathcal{C}^N$*;*

(ii): *there exist holomorphic PSD kernels $\Theta_k(w, \omega)$ on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, such that for any $(w, \omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$ one has*

$$I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^*\mathcal{F}(w) = \sum_{k=1}^{N}(1 - \overline{\omega_k}w_k)\Theta_k(w, \omega); \tag{4.2}$$

(iii): *there exist Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_N$ such that $\mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{X}_k$, and a unitary operator $U = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{U})$ such that*

$$\mathcal{F}(w) = D + CP(w)(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(w))^{-1}B, \tag{4.3}$$

where $P(w) := \sum_{k=1}^N w_k P_{\mathcal{X}_k}$, i.e., $\mathcal{F}$ is the **transfer function** *of an* **Agler unitary colligation** *$\alpha = (N; U; \mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$ (we will write $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ in this case) with the* **state space** *$\mathcal{X}$, and the same* **input and output spaces** *equal to $\mathcal{U}$.*

The *Agler–Schur class* $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$ consists of all functions satisfying any (and, hence, all) of conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.2. *A holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function $\mathcal{F}$ on $\mathbb{D}^N$ can be represented as $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$ for some $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ if and only if the following conditions are fulfilled:*

(i): *$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_\alpha$ for an Agler unitary colligation $\alpha = (N; U; \mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{U})$ with the additional condition $U = U^*$;*

(ii): $1 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{F}(0))$.

Proof. **Necessity.** Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Then (3.1) and (3.2) hold. As we have shown in Theorem 3.1, the identity (3.1) implies the identity (3.9) for the holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function F on $\mathbb{D}^N$ which is defined by (3.8), with holomorphic PSD kernels $\Xi_k(w, \omega)$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$ defined by (3.10). Analogously, the identity (3.2) implies

$$F(w)-F(\omega)^* = \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\frac{1+w_k}{1-w_k}-\frac{1+\overline{\omega_k}}{1-\overline{\omega_k}}\right)\Phi_k\left(\frac{1+w_1}{1-w_1},\dots,\frac{1+w_N}{1-w_N};\frac{1+\omega_1}{1-\omega_1},\dots,\frac{1+\omega_N}{1-\omega_N}\right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{N}(w_k-\overline{\omega_k})\Xi_k(w,\omega), \quad (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.4}$$

with the same kernels $\Xi_k(w,\omega),\ k=1,\dots,N$. Let $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{C}(f)$, i.e., $\mathcal{F}$ is determined by f or F in accordance with (4.1). Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\mathcal{U}}-\mathcal{F}(\omega)^*\mathcal{F}(w) &= I_{\mathcal{U}}-\left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}\left(F(\omega)^*-I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\left(F(w)-I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}\left[\left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)-\left(F(\omega)^*-I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\left(F(w)-I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)\right] \\ &\quad\times\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1} = 2\left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}\left(F(w)+F(\omega)^*\right)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

According to (3.9), we get

$$I_{\mathcal{U}}-\mathcal{F}(\omega)^*\mathcal{F}(w)=\sum_{k=1}^{N}(1-\overline{\omega_k}w_k)\Theta_k(w,\omega), \quad (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\Theta_k(w,\omega)=2\left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}\Xi_k(w,\omega)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}. \tag{4.6}$$

Since $\Xi_k(w,\omega)=\xi_k(\omega)^*\xi_k(w),\ (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N$, where ξ_k are holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$, one has

$$\Theta_k(w,\omega)=\theta_k(\omega)^*\theta_k(w), \quad (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$\theta_k(w)=\sqrt{2}\xi_k(w)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}, \quad (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.8}$$

are also holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$. Thus, $\Theta_k(w,\omega),\ k=1,\dots,N$, are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N$, and due to (4.5), $\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Analogously,

$$\mathcal{F}(w)-\mathcal{F}(\omega)^*=2\left(F(\omega)^*+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1}\left(F(w)-F(\omega)^*\right)\left(F(w)+I_{\mathcal{U}}\right)^{-1},$$

and according to (4.4) we get

$$\mathcal{F}(w)-\mathcal{F}(\omega)^*=\sum_{k=1}^{N}(w_k-\overline{\omega_k})\Theta_k(w,\omega), \quad (w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.9}$$

with the same set of kernels $\Theta_k(w,\omega),\ k=1,\dots,N$, defined by (4.6). Let us rewrite (4.5) and (4.9) in a somewhat different way. Since $f\in\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ satisfies $f(\overline{z})=f(z)^*,\ z\in\Pi^N$, one has also

$$F(\overline{w})=F(w)^*, \quad \mathcal{F}(\overline{w})=\mathcal{F}(w)^*, \quad w\in\mathbb{D}^N.$$

Therefore, (4.5) and (4.9) are equivalent to the following two identities, respectively:

$$I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(w)\mathcal{F}(\omega)^* = \sum_{k=1}^{N}(1 - w_k\overline{\omega_k})\widetilde{\theta_k}(w)\widetilde{\theta_k}(\omega)^*, \quad (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.10}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(w) - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^* = \sum_{k=1}^{N}(w_k - \overline{\omega_k})\widetilde{\theta_k}(w)\widetilde{\theta_k}(\omega)^*, \quad (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N, \tag{4.11}$$

where $\widetilde{\theta_k}(w) = \theta_k(\bar{w})^*$ are holomorphic $L(\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{U})$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$. We will show that the identities (4.10) and (4.11) allow to construct an Agler unitary colligation satisfying condition (i) of this theorem. For this purpose, we will use the functional model of an Agler colligation by J. A. Ball and T. T. Trent [6].

Let us remind their construction. Let $W \in \mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{Y})$ (the definition of $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{Y})$ is the same as of $\mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$, with only difference that values of functions from this class are in $L(\mathcal{U},\mathcal{Y})$). Then there exist Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{L}_k$ and holomorphic functions H_k, H_{*k} on $\mathbb{D}^N$ taking values in $L(\mathcal{L}_k,\mathcal{Y})$ and $L(\mathcal{L}_k,\mathcal{U})$, $k = 1,\dots,N$, respectively, such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} - W(\bar{w})^*W(\bar{\omega}) & W(\bar{w})^* - W(\omega)^* \\ W(w) - W(\bar{\omega}) & I_{\mathcal{Y}} - W(w)W(\omega)^* \end{bmatrix} =$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - w_k\overline{\omega_k} & w_k - \overline{\omega_k} \\ w_k - \overline{\omega_k} & 1 - w_k\overline{\omega_k} \end{bmatrix} \circ \begin{bmatrix} H_{*k}(w)H_{*k}(\omega)^* & H_{*k}(w)H_k(\omega)^* \\ H_k(w)H_{*k}(\omega)^* & H_k(w)H_k(\omega)^* \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.12}$$

for all $(w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, where "$\circ$" is a *Schur (entry-wise) matrix multiplication.* For every $k = 1,\dots,N$ and $(w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, set

$$K_{*k}(w,\omega) := H_{*k}(w)H_{*k}(\omega)^*, \qquad K_k(w,\omega) := H_k(w)H_k(\omega)^*,$$
$$L_k(w,\omega) := H_{*k}(w)H_k(\omega)^*, \quad L_{*k}(w,\omega) := L_k(\omega,w)^* = H_k(w)H_{*k}(\omega)^*,$$

and

$$\widehat{K_k}(w,\omega) := \begin{bmatrix} K_{*k}(w,\omega) & L_k(w,\omega) \\ L_{*k}(w,\omega) & K_k(w,\omega) \end{bmatrix}.$$

The latter function is a holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{Y})$-valued PSD kernel on $\mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, which serves as the reproducing kernel of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(\widehat{K_k})$ of holomorphic $(\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{Y})$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$; this space is determined uniquely by $\widehat{K_k}$ (for the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces see, e.g., [4]). Set $\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) := \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{H}(\widehat{K_k})$. The latter is a Hilbert space of holomorphic $(\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{Y})^N$-valued functions on $\mathbb{D}^N$, with the reproducing kernel $\widehat{K}(w,\omega) := \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \widehat{K_k}(w,\omega)$. Define the lineals $\mathcal{D}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \subset \mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{Y}$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_0 := \operatorname{span}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_1}K_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_1}L_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{w_N}K_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_N}L_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ I_{\mathcal{U}} \end{bmatrix} u, \begin{bmatrix} L_1(\cdot,w) \\ K_1(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ L_N(\cdot,w) \\ K_N(\cdot,w) \\ W(w)^* \end{bmatrix} y : \ u \in \mathcal{U}, y \in \mathcal{Y}, w \in \mathbb{D}^N \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{R}_0 := \operatorname{span}\left\{ \begin{bmatrix} K_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ L_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ K_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ L_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ W(\overline{w}) \end{bmatrix} u, \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_1}L_1(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_1}K_1(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{w_N}L_N(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_N}K_N(\cdot,w) \\ I_{\mathcal{Y}} \end{bmatrix} y : \ u \in \mathcal{U}, y \in \mathcal{Y}, w \in \mathbb{D}^N \right\}.$$

The operator $U_0 : \mathcal{D}_0 \to \mathcal{R}_0$, correctly defined by

$$U_0 : \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_1}K_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_1}L_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{w_N}K_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_N}L_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ I_{\mathcal{U}} \end{bmatrix} u \longmapsto \begin{bmatrix} K_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ L_{*1}(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ K_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ L_{*N}(\cdot,w) \\ W(\overline{w}) \end{bmatrix} u, \quad u \in \mathcal{U}, w \in \mathbb{D}^N,$$

$$U_0 : \begin{bmatrix} L_1(\cdot,w) \\ K_1(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ L_N(\cdot,w) \\ K_N(\cdot,w) \\ W(w)^* \end{bmatrix} y \longmapsto \begin{bmatrix} \overline{w_1}L_1(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_1}K_1(\cdot,w) \\ \vdots \\ \overline{w_N}L_N(\cdot,w) \\ \overline{w_N}K_N(\cdot,w) \\ I_{\mathcal{Y}} \end{bmatrix} y, \quad y \in \mathcal{Y}, w \in \mathbb{D}^N,$$

is uniquely extended to the (correctly defined) unitary operator $\widetilde{U_0} : \operatorname{clos}(\mathcal{D}_0) \to \operatorname{clos}(\mathcal{R}_0)$. In the case where

$$\dim\{(\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{U}) \ominus \operatorname{clos}(\mathcal{D}_0)\} = \dim\{(\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{Y}) \ominus \operatorname{clos}(\mathcal{R}_0)\} \tag{4.13}$$

there exists a (non-unique!) unitary operator $U : \mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{Y}$ such that $U|\operatorname{clos}(\mathcal{D}_0) = \widetilde{U_0}$. The corresponding Agler unitary colligation is $\alpha = (N; U; \mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{H}(\widehat{K_k}), U, Y)$, and $W = W_\alpha$, i.e., W is the transfer function of α.

Let us apply this construction to a function $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$ where $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(U)$. In this case $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{U}$, $W = \mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\overline{w}) = \mathcal{F}(w)^*$, $w \in \mathbb{D}^N$, it follows from (4.10) and (4.11) that (4.12) holds with $H_k = H_{*k} = \widetilde{\theta}_k$, $k = 1, \dots, N$. Therefore, for $k = 1, \dots, N$ one has

$$K_k(w,\omega) = K_{*k}(w,\omega) = L_k(w,\omega) = L_{*k}(w,\omega), \ (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N. \tag{4.14}$$

In turn, this means $\mathcal{D}_0 = \mathcal{R}_0$, and

$$(\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{U}) \ominus \mathrm{clos}(\mathcal{D}_0) = (\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{Y}) \ominus \mathrm{clos}(\mathcal{R}_0).$$

In particular, (4.13) holds. Define the operator

$$U := \widetilde{U_0} \oplus I_{(\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N)\oplus\mathcal{U})\ominus\mathrm{clos}(\mathcal{D}_0)} \in L(\mathcal{D}(\{\widehat{K_k}\}_{k=1}^N) \oplus \mathcal{U}).$$

Clearly, U is unitary. Let us show that $U = U^*$. From the definition of U_0 and (4.14) it follows that $U_0 = U_0^{-1}$. Therefore $\widetilde{U_0} = \widetilde{U_0}^{-1}$ and $U = U^{-1}$. Since $U^* = U^{-1}$, we obtain $U = U^*$. Thus, condition (i) is fulfilled.

Since $f(e) = f(e)^* \geq 0$ where $e = (1, \dots, 1)$, the operator $f(e) \in L(\mathcal{U})$ has a spectral decomposition (see, e.g., [3])

$$f(e) = \int_0^{\|f(e)\|} t \, dE_t,$$

therefore,

$$\mathcal{F}(0) = (f(e) - I_{\mathcal{U}})(f(e) + I_{\mathcal{U}})^{-1} = \int_0^{\|f(e)\|} \frac{t-1}{t+1} \, dE_t.$$

Since the function $s(t) = \frac{t-1}{t+1}$ increases on the segment $[0, \|f(e)\|]$, one has $\mathcal{F}(0) \leq \frac{\|f(e)\|-1}{\|f(e)\|+1} I_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since $\frac{\|f(e)\|-1}{\|f(e)\|+1} < 1$, we conclude that $1 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{F}(0))$, i.e., condition (ii) is also fulfilled.

Sufficiency. Let conditions (i) and (ii) for the function $\mathcal{F}$ satisfy. Since $U = U^* = U^{-1}$, one has $D = D^*$ and D is a contraction in $\mathcal{U}$. Since $\mathcal{F}(0) = D$ and $1 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{F}(0))$, we get $\sigma(\mathcal{F}(0)) \subset [-1, a]$ with some $a: \ -1 \leq a < 1$. Hence, $\sigma(\frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(0)}{2}) \subset [0, \frac{1+a}{2}]$, thus $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(0)}{2} \right\| \leq \frac{1+a}{2} < 1$. By the maximum principle for holomorphic operator-valued functions of several variables (e.g., see [18]), $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w)}{2} \right\| < 1$ for all $w \in \mathbb{D}^N$. Indeed, (i) implies $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$, and therefore $\frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}}{2} \in \mathcal{AS}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Thus $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w)}{2} \right\| \leq 1$ for all $w \in \mathbb{D}^N$. If for some $w_0 \in \mathbb{D}^N$ one had $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w_0)}{2} \right\| = 1$, then the maximum principle would imply $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w)}{2} \right\| = 1$ everywhere in $\mathbb{D}^N$. In particular, $\left\| \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(0)}{2} \right\| = 1$, that is not true. Finally, we get $1 \notin \sigma(\frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w)}{2})$, and therefore $1 \notin \sigma(\mathcal{F}(w))$ for all $w \in \mathbb{D}^N$. Thus, the function $F(w) = (I_{\mathcal{U}}+\mathcal{F}(w))(I_{\mathcal{U}}-\mathcal{F}(w))^{-1}$ is correctly defined and holomorphic on $\mathbb{D}^N$. It is easy to see that

$$F(w) + F(\omega)^* = 2(I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^*)^{-1}(I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^*\mathcal{F}(w))(I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(w))^{-1}, \tag{4.15}$$

$$F(w) - F(\omega)^* = 2(I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^*)^{-1}(\mathcal{F}(w) - \mathcal{F}(\omega)^*)(I_{\mathcal{U}} - \mathcal{F}(w))^{-1} \tag{4.16}$$

for all $(w,\omega)\in\mathbb{D}^N\times\mathbb{D}^N$. Since $U=U^{-1}=U^*$, due to (4.3) one has

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\mathcal U}-\mathcal F(\omega)^*\mathcal F(w) &= I_{\mathcal U}-[D+CP(\omega)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(\omega))^{-1}B]^*\\
&\quad\times[D+CP(w)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B]=I_{\mathcal U}-D^*D\\
&\quad-D^*CP(w)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B-B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A^*)^{-1}P(\bar\omega)C^*D\\
&\quad-B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A^*)^{-1}P(\bar\omega)C^*CP(w)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B\\
&= B^*B+B^*AP(w)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B+B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A^*)^{-1}P(\bar\omega)A^*B\\
&\quad-B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A^*)^{-1}P(\bar\omega)(I_{\mathcal X}-A^*A)P(w)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B\\
&= B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)^{-1}[(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))+(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)AP(w)\\
&\quad+P(\bar\omega)A(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))-P(\bar\omega)(I_{\mathcal X}-A^2)P(w)](I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B\\
&= B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)^{-1}(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)P(w))(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B\\
&= \sum_{k=1}^N(1-\overline{\omega_k}w_k)B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)^{-1}P_{\mathcal X_k}(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B.
\end{aligned}$$

Analogously,

$$\mathcal F(w)-\mathcal F(\omega)^*=\sum_{k=1}^N(w_k-\overline{\omega_k})B^*(I_{\mathcal X}-P(\bar\omega)A)^{-1}P_{\mathcal X_k}(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B.$$

Thus, from (4.15) and (4.16) we obtain that F satisfies (3.9) and (4.4) with $\Xi_k(w,\omega)=\xi_k(\omega)^*\xi_k(w)$, where

$$\xi_k(w)=\sqrt{2}P_{\mathcal X_k}(I_{\mathcal X}-AP(w))^{-1}B(I_{\mathcal U}-\mathcal F(w))^{-1},\quad w\in\mathbb D^N,\ k=1,\dots,N.$$

Since for $z_k\in\Pi,\zeta_k\in\Pi$ one has

$$1-\frac{\overline{\zeta_k}-1}{\overline{\zeta_k}+1}\cdot\frac{z_k-1}{z_k+1}=\frac{2(z_k+\overline{\zeta_k})}{(\overline{\zeta_k}+1)(z_k+1)},\qquad \frac{z_k-1}{z_k+1}-\frac{\overline{\zeta_k}-1}{\overline{\zeta_k}+1}=\frac{2(z_k-\overline{\zeta_k})}{(\overline{\zeta_k}+1)(z_k+1)},$$

by setting $w_k=\frac{z_k-1}{z_k+1}$ and $\omega_k=\frac{\zeta_k-1}{\zeta_k+1}$, $k=1,\dots,N$, in (3.9) and (4.4), we get for $f(z)=F(\frac{z_1-1}{z_1+1},\dots,\frac{z_N-1}{z_N+1})$ the identities (3.1) and (3.2) with $\Phi_k(z,\zeta)=\varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z),\ (z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_k(z)&=\frac{\sqrt2}{z_k+1}\xi_k\left(\frac{z_1-1}{z_1+1},\dots,\frac{z_N-1}{z_N+1}\right)\\
&=\frac{2}{z_k+1}P_{\mathcal X_k}\left(I_{\mathcal X}-A\sum_{k=1}^N\frac{z_k-1}{z_k+1}P_{\mathcal X_k}\right)^{-1}B\left(I_{\mathcal U}-\mathcal F\left(\frac{z_1-1}{z_1+1},\dots,\frac{z_N-1}{z_N+1}\right)\right)^{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

$k=1,\dots,N$. Thus, finally we get $\mathcal F=\mathcal C(f)$ where $f\in\mathcal B_N(\mathcal U)$. The proof is complete. □

5. De-homogenization

In this section we establish a one-to-one correspondence between the classes $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and certain classes of non-homogeneous holomorphic functions of $N-1$ variables.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $f \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Then the function*

$$g(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}) := f(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, 1) \tag{5.1}$$

is holomorphic in the domain $\Omega^+_{N-1} := \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}\cap\Pi}(\lambda\Pi)^{N-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{N-1}$ and has the properties:

- **(i):** $g(\overline{z'}) = g(z')^*, \quad z' \in \Omega^+_{N-1};$
- **(ii):** $Re\left[z_N g\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right)\right] \geq 0, \quad z = (z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, z_N) \in \Pi^N.$

Conversely, let an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function $g(z') = g(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1})$ be holomorphic in the domain Ω^+_{N-1} and satisfy conditions (i) and (ii). Then the function

$$f(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, z_N) := z_N g\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right) \tag{5.2}$$

is correctly defined on Ω_N and belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. The function g defined by (5.1) is holomorphic in the domain

$$\begin{aligned} & \{z' = (z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{N-1} : \ (z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, 1) \in \Omega_N\} \\ = \ & \{z' \in \mathbb{C}^{N-1} : \ \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{T} : \ (z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, 1) \in (\lambda\Pi)^N\} \\ = \ & \{z' \in \mathbb{C}^{N-1} : \ \exists \lambda \in \mathbb{T}\cap\Pi : \ z' \in (\lambda\Pi)^{N-1}\} = \Omega^+_{N-1}, \end{aligned}$$

since $1 \in \lambda\Pi$ means $\lambda \in \Pi$. Clearly, (i) is valid for g since (2.3) is valid for f. For any $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, z_N) \in \Pi^N$, due to (2.1) and (2.2) for f, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}\left[z_N g\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right)\right] &= \mathrm{Re}\left[z_N f\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}, 1\right)\right] \\ &= \mathrm{Re} f(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1}, z_N) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (ii) is valid, too.

Conversely, let an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function $g(z') = g(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1})$ be holomorphic in Ω^+_{N-1} and satisfy (i) and (ii). Then the function f is correctly defined by (5.2). Indeed, for any $z \in \Omega_N$ there is a $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $z \in (\lambda\Pi)^N$. Hence, $\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right) \in \left(e^{i(\arg\lambda - \arg z_N)}\Pi\right)^{N-1}$. Since $\arg z_N \in (\arg\lambda - \frac{\pi}{2}, \arg\lambda + \frac{\pi}{2})$, one has $\arg\lambda - \arg z_N \in (-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$. Therefore, $\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right) \in \Omega^+_{N-1}$. Moreover, f is holomorphic in Ω_N. Properties (2.1)–(2.3) of f are easily verified. Thus, $f \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$. The proof is complete. □

Theorem 5.2. *Let $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$. Then the function g defined by (5.1) is holomorphic in the domain Ω^+_{N-1} and has the properties:*

- **(i):** $g(\overline{z'}) = g(z')^*, \quad z' \in \Omega^+_{N-1};$

- **(ii):** *for any* $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$ *such that* $R_k \in L(\mathcal{H})$, $k = 1, \ldots, N$, *where* $\mathcal{H}$ *is some Hilbert space, the operator* $g(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1})$ *is correctly defined and* $Re[(I_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes R_N)g(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1})] \geq 0$.

Conversely, let an $L(\mathcal{U})$*-valued function* $g(z') = g(z_1, \ldots, z_{N-1})$ *be holomorphic in the domain* Ω_{N-1}^+ *and satisfy conditions (i) and (ii). Then the function* f *is correctly defined by (5.2) and belongs to the class* $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. Since $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U}) \subset \mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, by Theorem 5.1 the function g is holomorphic in Ω_{N-1}^+ and satisfies (i). Since the function $g\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}\right) = f\left(\frac{z_1}{z_N}, \ldots, \frac{z_{N-1}}{z_N}, 1\right)$ is holomorphic in $z = (z_1, \ldots, z_N) \in \Omega_N$, the operator $g(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1})$ is correctly defined for any $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \ldots, R_N) \in \mathcal{A}^N$ (see Section 3). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}[(I_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes R_N)g(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1})] &= \\ \mathrm{Re}[(I_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes R_N)f(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1}, I_{\mathcal{H}})] &= \mathrm{Re} f(R_1, \ldots, R_{N-1}, R_N) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

due to properties (i) and (ii) of f in Corollary 3.2. Thus g has property (ii) of the present theorem.

Conversely, let an $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function $g(z')$ be holomorphic in Ω_{N-1}^+ and satisfy conditions (i) and (ii) of this theorem. In particular, g satisfies conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 5.1. Then the function f is correctly defined by (5.2) and belongs to the class $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$. According to Corollary 3.2, the only thing we have to check is that $\mathrm{Re} f(\mathbf{R}) \geq 0$ for any $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$. The latter follows easily:

$$\mathrm{Re} f(R_1, \ldots, R_{N-1}, R_N) = \mathrm{Re}[(I_{\mathcal{U}} \otimes R_N)g(R_N^{-1}R_1, \ldots, R_N^{-1}R_{N-1})] \geq 0.$$

The proof is complete. □

6. The “real” case

Let us introduce the operator analogues of real matrices, and operator-valued analogues of real matrix-valued functions. To this end, first of all we define an anti-linear operator which generalizes the complex conjugation in $\mathbb{C}^n$.

The operator ι on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$ is called an *anti-unitary involution* (AUI) if the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\iota^2 = I_{\mathcal{U}}; \tag{6.1}$$

$$\langle \iota u_1, \iota u_2 \rangle = \langle u_2, u_1 \rangle, \quad u_1 \in \mathcal{U},\ u_2 \in \mathcal{U}. \tag{6.2}$$

Proposition 6.1. *An AUI* ι *has the following properties:*

- **(i):** ι *is* **additive**, *i.e., for any* $u_1 \in \mathcal{U}$, $u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$ *one has* $\iota(u_1 + u_2) = \iota u_1 + \iota u_2$;
- **(ii):** ι *is* **anti-homogeneous**, *i.e., for any* $u \in \mathcal{U}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ *one has* $\iota(\alpha u) = \bar{\alpha}\iota u$;
- **(iii):** *the operators* $\pi_\pm := \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}} \pm \iota}{2}$ *are idempotents, their ranges* $\pi_\pm \mathcal{U}$ *are closed in* $\mathcal{U}$, *and* $\pi_+\mathcal{U} \dot{+} \pi_-\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Let $u_1 \in \mathcal{U},\ u_2 \in \mathcal{U}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\iota(u_1+u_2)-\iota u_1-\iota u_2\|^2 = \|\iota(u_1+u_2)\|^2+\|\iota u_1\|^2+\|\iota u_2\|^2 \\ - &\quad 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \iota(u_1+u_2), \iota u_1+\iota u_2\rangle + 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \iota u_1, \iota u_2\rangle \\ = &\quad \|u_1+u_2\|^2+\|u_1\|^2+\|u_2\|^2 - 2\mathrm{Re}\langle u_1, u_1+u_2\rangle - 2\mathrm{Re}\langle u_2, u_1+u_2\rangle \\ + &\quad 2\mathrm{Re}\langle u_2, u_1\rangle = \|u_1\|^2+\|u_2\|^2-\|u_1+u_2\|^2+2\mathrm{Re}\langle u_2,u_1\rangle = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\iota(u_1+u_2)-\iota u_1-\iota u_2 = 0$, that proves (i). Next, for any $u \in \mathcal{U},\ \alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \|\iota(\alpha u)-\bar{\alpha}\iota u\|^2 &= \|\iota(\alpha u)\|^2 - 2\mathrm{Re}\langle \iota(\alpha u), \bar{\alpha}\iota u\rangle + |\alpha|^2\|\iota u\|^2 \\ &= \|\alpha u\|^2 - 2\mathrm{Re}(\alpha\langle \iota(\alpha u), \iota u\rangle) + |\alpha|^2\|u\|^2 \\ &= 2|\alpha|^2\|u\|^2 - 2\mathrm{Re}(\alpha\langle u, \alpha u\rangle) = 2|\alpha|^2\|u\|^2 - 2|\alpha|^2\|u\|^2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

that proves (ii). Since

$$\pi_\pm^2 = \frac{(I_{\mathcal{U}} \pm \iota)^2}{4} = \frac{(I_{\mathcal{U}} \pm 2\iota + \iota^2)}{4} = \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}} \pm \iota}{2} = \pi_\pm,$$

the operators $\pi_\pm$ are idempotents. Since ι preserves the norm, ι is continuous, thus $\pi_\pm$ are also continuous operators. The latter means that if $\pi_\pm u_j \to y$ as $j \to \infty$ then $\pi_\pm u_j = \pi_\pm(\pi_\pm u_j) \to \pi_\pm y$, i.e., $y = \pi_\pm y \in \pi_\pm \mathcal{U}$. Therefore, $\pi_\pm \mathcal{U}$ are closed lineals in $\mathcal{U}$.

If $\pi_+ u_1 = \pi_- u_2$ then $\pi_+^2 u_1 = \pi_+\pi_- u_2$. Since $\pi_+^2 = \pi_+$ and $\pi_+\pi_- = \frac{(I_{\mathcal{U}}+\iota)(I_{\mathcal{U}}-\iota)}{4} = \frac{I_{\mathcal{U}}-\iota^2}{4} = 0$, one has $\pi_+ u_1 = \pi_- u_2 = 0$, i.e., $\pi_+\mathcal{U} \cap \pi_-\mathcal{U} = \{0\}$. Since for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$ one has $u = \pi_+ u + \pi_- u$, and $\pi_\pm u \in \pi_\pm \mathcal{U}$, we get $\pi_+\mathcal{U} \dotplus \pi_-\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}$. The proof is complete. ☐

Example 1. Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{C}^n$. For $u = \mathrm{col}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ denote $\bar{u} := \mathrm{col}(\overline{u_1}, \dots, \overline{u_n})$. Set $\iota u := \bar{u}$, i.e, ι is the complex conjugation in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then, clearly, ι is an AUI and

$$\pi_+ u = \mathrm{Re}\, u = \mathrm{col}(\mathrm{Re}\, u_1, \dots, \mathrm{Re}\, u_n),\ \ \pi_- u = i\mathrm{Im}\, u = i\mathrm{col}(\mathrm{Im}\, u_1, \dots, \mathrm{Im}\, u_n).$$

The operator $A \in L(\mathcal{U})$ is called *ι-real* (resp., *ι-symmetric*) if $\iota A = A\iota$ (resp., $\iota A = A^*\iota$).

Example 2. Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\iota u = \bar{u}$, as in Example 1. Then the operator $A \in L(\mathcal{U})$ is ι-real (resp., ι-symmetric) if and only if its matrix in the standard basis $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^n$ has real entries (resp., is symmetric, i.e., $A^T = A$). Indeed, in the first case

$$\begin{aligned} a_{kj} &= \langle Ae_j, e_k\rangle = \langle \iota e_k, \iota Ae_j\rangle = \langle \iota e_k, A\iota e_j\rangle \\ &= \langle e_k, Ae_j\rangle = \overline{\langle Ae_j, e_k\rangle} = \overline{a_{kj}}, \quad k, j = 1, \dots, n; \end{aligned}$$

in the second case

$$\begin{aligned} a_{kj} &= \langle Ae_j, e_k\rangle = \langle \iota e_k, \iota Ae_j\rangle = \langle \iota e_k, A^*\iota e_j\rangle \\ &= \langle e_k, A^* e_j\rangle = \langle Ae_k, e_j\rangle = a_{jk}, \quad k, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\iota = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ be an AUI on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$, and $A \in L(\mathcal{U})$. For the following three conditions, any two of them imply the third one:*

(i): *$\iota A = A\iota$;*
(ii): *$\iota A = A^*\iota$;*
(iii): *$A = A^*$.*

Proof. (i)&(ii)⇒(iii). If $\iota A = A\iota$ and $\iota A = A^*\iota$ then $A\iota = A^*\iota$. Therefore, $A\iota^2 = A^*\iota^2$, i.e., $A = A^*$.

Implications (i)&(iii)⇒(ii) and (ii)&(iii)⇒(i) are obvious. □

Let ι be an AUI on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a domain invariant under the complex conjugation: $\overline{\Omega} = \Omega$. For a function $f : \Omega \to L(\mathcal{U})$ set $f^\sharp(z) = \iota f(\bar{z})\iota,\ z \in \Omega$. A function $f : \Omega \to L(\mathcal{U})$ is called *ι-real* if for any $z \in \Omega$ one has $f^\sharp(z) = f(z)$.

Example 3. Let $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\iota u = \bar{u}$, as in Examples 1 and 2, and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ be a domain satisfying $\overline{\Omega} = \Omega$. Then ι-real $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions are those matrix functions whose values in the standard basis $\{e_k\}_{k=1}^n$ satisfy the condition $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}[f(\bar{z})]_{kj} &= \langle f(\bar{z})e_j, e_k\rangle = \langle f(\bar{z})\iota e_j, \iota e_k\rangle = \langle \iota^2 e_k, \iota f(\bar{z})\iota e_j\rangle \\ &= \langle e_k, f(z)e_j\rangle = \overline{\langle f(z)e_j, e_k\rangle} = \overline{[f(z)]_{kj}}, \quad k, j = 1, \dots, n.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a Hilbert space and $\iota = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ be an AUI on $\mathcal{U}$. Denote by $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ the subclasses of $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, respectively, consisting of ι-real functions. Clearly, $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U}) \subset \iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$.

Proposition 6.3. *The Taylor coefficients of functions from $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, and therefore, functions from $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ satisfy conditions (i)–(iii) of Lemma 6.2.*

Proof. According to Lemma 6.2, it is sufficient to verify any two of its conditions, e.g., (i) and (iii), for the Taylor coefficients of an arbitrary function $f \in \iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$. It follows from Proposition 6.1 that

$$f^\sharp(z) = \iota f(\bar{z})\iota = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \iota\widehat{f}_t(\bar{z} - \overline{z^\circ})^t\iota = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \iota\widehat{f}_t\iota(z - z^\circ)^t$$

in some neighborhood Γ of $z^\circ \in \Omega_N$. Since f is ι-real,

$$f^\sharp(z) = f(z) = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{f}_t(z - z^\circ)^t$$

in some neighborhood Γ' of $z^\circ \in \Omega_N$. By the uniqueness of Taylor's expansion in the neighborhood $\Gamma \cap \Gamma'$ of z°, we get $\iota\widehat{f}_t\iota = \widehat{f}_t$ and $\iota\widehat{f}_t = \widehat{f}_t\iota$, for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}_+^N$, i.e., condition (i) is satisfied for all the Taylor coefficients of f. Since

$$f(\bar{z})^* = \left(\sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{f}_t(\bar{z} - \overline{z^\circ})^t\right)^* = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{f}_t^{\,*}(z - z^\circ)^t$$

in Γ, and

$$f(\bar{z})^* = f(z) = \sum_{t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N} \widehat{f}_t(z-z^\circ)^t$$

in Γ', by the uniqueness of Taylor's expansion in the neighborhood $\Gamma\cap\Gamma'$ of z°, we get $\widehat{f}_t^{\,*} = \widehat{f}_t$ for any $t\in\mathbb{Z}_+^N$, i.e, condition (iii) is also satisfied for all the Taylor coefficients of f. ☐

Theorem 6.4. *Let f be a holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function on Ω_N, and $\iota=\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ be an AUI on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- **(i):** *$f\in\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$;*
- **(ii):** *there exist a representation (2.5) of f and an AUI $\iota_{\mathcal{H}}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ such that the function $A(z)$ given by (2.6) is $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}}\oplus\iota_{\mathcal{H}})$-real;*
- **(iii):** *there exists a representation (2.11) of f for which the holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z,\zeta),\ k=1,\dots,N$, on $\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$ are $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real;*
- **(iv):** *there exist an Agler unitary colligation $\alpha=(N;U;\mathcal{X}=\bigoplus_{k=1}^N\mathcal{X}_k,\mathcal{U},\mathcal{U})$ with $U=U^*$, the corresponding representation (4.3) of $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{C}(f)$ (the latter is given by (4.1)) and an AUI $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ which commutes with the orthogonal projectors $P_k=P_{\mathcal{X}_k},\ k=1,\dots,N$, such that the operator U is $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}}\oplus\iota_{\mathcal{U}})$-real.*

Proof. (i)⇒(iii). By Theorem 2.7 there exists a representation (2.11) of f with holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z,\zeta),\ k=1,\dots,N$, on $\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$. Define

$$\Phi_k^\circ(z,\zeta) := \frac{\Phi_k(z,\zeta)+\Phi_k^\sharp(z,\zeta)}{2},\quad (z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N,\ k=1,\dots,N.$$

For any $u_1\in\mathcal{U},\ u_2\in\mathcal{U},\ k=1,\dots,N$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi_k^\sharp(z,\overline{\zeta})u_1,u_2\rangle &= \langle\iota\Phi_k(\bar{z},\zeta)\iota u_1,u_2\rangle = \langle\iota u_2,\Phi_k(\bar{z},\zeta)\iota u_1\rangle\\ &= \langle\Phi_k(\bar{z},\zeta)^*\iota u_2,\iota u_1\rangle = \langle\Phi_k(\zeta,\bar{z})\iota u_2,\iota u_1\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

which is, clearly, a holomorphic function in $(z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$ (we used the property (2.9) of PSD kernels). Thus, $\Phi_k^\sharp(z,\overline{\zeta})$ and, therefore, $\Phi_k^\circ(z,\overline{\zeta})$ are holomorphic operator-valued functions on $\Pi^N\times\Pi^N$. Since for any $u_1\in\mathcal{U},\ u_2\in\mathcal{U}$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\Phi_k^\sharp(z,\zeta)u_1,u_2\rangle &= \langle\Phi_k(\overline{\zeta},\bar{z})\iota u_2,\iota u_1\rangle = \langle u_1,\iota\Phi_k(\bar{\zeta},\bar{z})\iota u_2\rangle\\ &= \langle u_1,\Phi_k^\sharp(\zeta,z)u_2\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

one has $\Phi_k^\sharp(\zeta,z)=\Phi_k^\sharp(z,\zeta)^*$ and, therefore, $\Phi_k^\circ(\zeta,z)=\Phi_k^\circ(z,\zeta)^*$ for all $(z,\zeta)\in\Pi^N\times\Pi^N,\ k=1,\dots,N$, i.e., $\Phi_k^\circ(z,\zeta)$ satisfies condition (2.9).

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{z^{(\mu)}\}_{\mu=1}^m \subset \Pi^N$, $\{u^{(\mu)}\}_{\mu=1}^m \subset \mathcal{U}$. Then for $k = 1, \dots, N$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \Phi_k^\sharp(z^{(\mu)}, z^{(\nu)}) u^{(\mu)}, u^{(\nu)} \rangle &= \sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \iota \Phi_k(\overline{z^{(\mu)}}, \overline{z^{(\nu)}}) \iota u^{(\mu)}, u^{(\nu)} \rangle \\ \sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \iota u^{(\nu)}, \Phi_k(\overline{z^{(\mu)}}, \overline{z^{(\nu)}}) \iota u^{(\mu)} \rangle &= \sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \iota u^{(\nu)}, \Phi_k(\overline{z^{(\nu)}}, \overline{z^{(\mu)}})^* \iota u^{(\mu)} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{\mu=1}^m \sum_{\nu=1}^m \langle \Phi_k(\overline{z^{(\nu)}}, \overline{z^{(\mu)}}) \iota u^{(\nu)}, \iota u^{(\mu)} \rangle \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by virtue of (2.10) for $\Phi_k(z, \zeta)$. Thus, $\Phi_k^\sharp(z, \zeta)$ and, therefore, $\Phi_k^\circ(z, \zeta)$ satisfy condition (2.10). Finally, we have proved that $\Phi_k^\sharp(z, \zeta)$ and, therefore, $\Phi_k^\circ(z, \zeta)$ are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Pi^N \times \Pi^N$.

Since $f^\sharp(z) = \iota f(\bar{z}) \iota = f(z)$, the identity (2.11) together with properties (i) and (ii) in Proposition 6.1 of ι imply

$$\begin{aligned} f(z) &= \iota \left(\sum_{k=1}^N \overline{z_k} \Phi_k(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \right) \iota = \sum_{k=1}^N z_k \iota \Phi_k(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \iota \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^N z_k \Phi_k^\sharp(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^N z_k \Phi_k^\circ(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$. Moreover,

$$\Phi_k^{\circ\sharp}(z, \zeta) = \frac{\Phi_k^\sharp(z, \zeta) + \Phi_k^{\sharp\sharp}(z, \zeta)}{2} = \frac{\Phi_k^\sharp(z, \zeta) + \Phi_k(z, \zeta)}{2} = \Phi_k^\circ(z, \zeta).$$

Thus, (2.11) holds with $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k^\circ(z, \zeta)$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, and (iii) follows from (i).

(iii)⇒(ii). Recall that holomorphic PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z, \zeta)$ admit factorizations $\Phi_k(z, \zeta) = \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z)$, where φ_k are holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions on Π^N, and $\mathcal{M}_k$ are auxiliary Hilbert spaces, $k = 1, \dots, N$. These $\mathcal{M}_k$'s and φ_k's can be determined in the following way. Set $\widetilde{\Phi_k}(z, \zeta) := \Phi_k(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})^*$. It is easy to convince oneself that $\widetilde{\Phi_k}(z, \zeta)$ are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Pi^N \times \Pi^N$. Then set $\mathcal{M}_k := \mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{\Phi_k}}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{\widetilde{\Phi_k}}$ denotes the Hilbert space with the reproducing kernel $\widetilde{\Phi_k}(z, \zeta)$, which is obtained by completion of the linear span of functions of the form $\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot, \zeta) u$, $\zeta \in \Pi^N$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$, with respect to the inner product

$$\langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot, \zeta) u, \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot, \zeta') u' \rangle := \langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\zeta', \zeta) u, u' \rangle.$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{\Phi_k}(z, \zeta) = H_k(z) H_k(\zeta)^*$, $(z, \zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$, where H_k is a holomorphic $L(\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{U})$-valued function on Π^N defined by $H_k(z)^* u := \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot, z) u$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Set $\varphi_k(z) := \widetilde{H}_k(z) = H_k(\overline{z})^*$. Then for $u \in \mathcal{U}$ one has $\varphi_k(z) u = \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot, \bar{z}) u$, and

$$\Phi_k(z, \zeta) = \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})^* = H_k(\bar{\zeta}) H_k(\bar{z})^* = \varphi_k(\zeta)^* \varphi_k(z).$$

Define the AUI $\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k} : \mathcal{M}_k \to \mathcal{M}_k$ on generating vectors by

$$\begin{aligned} (\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}[\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta)u])(z) &:= \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\bar{z},\zeta)u \\ &(= \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\Phi_k(z,\bar{\zeta})^*u = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\Phi_k(\bar{\zeta},z)u = \Phi_k(\zeta,\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u \\ &= \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\bar{\zeta},z)^*\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u = \widetilde{\Phi_k}(z,\bar{\zeta})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u),\ (z,\zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N, u \in \mathcal{U}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

This definition is correct. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta)u, \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta')u'\rangle &= \langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\bar{\zeta})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u, \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\overline{\zeta'})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u'\rangle = \langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\overline{\zeta'},\bar{\zeta})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u, \iota_{\mathcal{U}}u'\rangle \\ = \langle u', \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\overline{\zeta'},\bar{\zeta})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u\rangle &= \langle u', \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\zeta',\zeta)u\rangle = \langle u', \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\zeta,\zeta')^*u\rangle = \langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\zeta,\zeta')u', u\rangle \\ &= \langle \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta')u', \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta)u\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ preserves the norm of any vector of the form $\sum_{\mu=1}^m \widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta^{(\mu)})u^{(\mu)}$. The density of such vectors in $\mathcal{M}_k$ implies

$$\langle \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}m, \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}m'\rangle = \langle m', m\rangle \quad m \in \mathcal{M}_k, m' \in \mathcal{M}_k,$$

that is an analogue of (6.2). Next,

$$\begin{aligned} (\iota^2_{\mathcal{M}_k}[\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\zeta)u])(z) &= (\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}[\widetilde{\Phi_k}(\cdot,\bar{\zeta})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u])(z) = \widetilde{\Phi_k}(z,\zeta)\iota^2_{\mathcal{U}}u \\ &= \widetilde{\Phi_k}(z,\zeta)u, \quad (z,\zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N, u \in \mathcal{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by the additivity of $\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ (and $\iota^2_{\mathcal{M}_k}$) and the linearity and continuity ($\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ is norm-preserving!) argument, we get $\iota^2_{\mathcal{M}_k} = I_{\mathcal{M}_k}$, i.e., an analogue of (6.1).

The identities in (6.3) imply

$$\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}\varphi_k(z) = \varphi_k(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad z \in \Pi^N. \tag{6.4}$$

Following the sufficiency part of the proof of Theorem 2.7, we obtain $\varphi(z) = \mathrm{col}[\begin{array}{ccc} \varphi_1(z) & \dots & \varphi_N(z) \end{array}]$,

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{clos span}_{z\in\Pi^N}\{[\varphi(z)-\varphi(e)]\mathcal{U}\} \subset \mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{M}_k,$$

$$A_k = \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e)^* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \kappa^* P_k \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H})$$

(here κ is defined by (2.16)) such that (2.5) holds for f, where

$$A_k = \begin{bmatrix} a_k & b_k \\ c_k & d_k \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}), \quad k = 1,\dots,N.$$

For $\psi(z) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z)-\varphi(e) \end{bmatrix}$ one has $\psi(e)\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}\oplus\{0\}$, therefore the linear span of vectors of the form $\psi(z)u,\ z \in \Pi^N,\ u \in \mathcal{U}$, is dense in $\mathcal{U}\oplus\mathcal{H}$. Set $\iota_{\mathcal{M}} := \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$. By virtue of (6.4), one has $\iota_{\mathcal{M}}(\varphi(z)-\varphi(e))u = (\varphi(\bar{z})-\varphi(e))\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u \in \mathcal{H}$, hence $\iota_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Set $\iota_{\mathcal{H}} := \iota_{\mathcal{M}}|\mathcal{H}$. Clearly, $\iota_{\mathcal{H}}$ is an AUI on $\mathcal{H}$, and $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}}\oplus\iota_{\mathcal{H}})\psi(z) = \psi(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}},\ z \in \Pi^N$.

Let us verify $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}})A_k(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) = A_k$, i.e., the $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}})$-realness of $A_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$. For any $z \in \Pi^N,\ \zeta \in \Pi^N,\ u \in \mathcal{U},\ u' \in \mathcal{U}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle A_k \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u, \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u' \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e)^* & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \kappa^* P_k \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u, \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u' \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle P_k \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u, \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u' \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle P_k \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u, \kappa \begin{bmatrix} \varphi(e) \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u' \right\rangle = \langle P_k \varphi(z) u, \varphi(\zeta) u' \rangle \\
&= \langle P_k \varphi(z) u, P_k \varphi(\zeta) u' \rangle = \langle \varphi_k(z) u, \varphi_k(\zeta) u' \rangle;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\langle (\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) A_k (\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u, \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u' \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle (\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u', A_k (\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \iota_{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi(\zeta) - \varphi(e)) \end{bmatrix} u', A_k \begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \iota_{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi(z) - \varphi(e)) \end{bmatrix} u \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\overline{\zeta}) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u', A_k \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\overline{z}) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle A_k \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\overline{\zeta}) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u', \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(\overline{z}) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u \right\rangle = \langle \varphi_k(\overline{\zeta}) \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u', \varphi_k(\overline{z}) \iota_{\mathcal{U}} u \rangle \\
&= \langle \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k} \varphi_k(\zeta) u', \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k} \varphi_k(z) u \rangle = \langle \varphi_k(z) u, \varphi_k(\zeta) u' \rangle
\end{aligned}$$

(in the second chain of calculations we used the result of the first one and (6.4)). As mentioned above, the linear span of vectors of the form $\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathcal{U}} \\ \varphi(z) - \varphi(e) \end{bmatrix} u,\ z \in \Pi^N,\ u \in \mathcal{U}$, is dense in $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{H}$. Operators A_k and $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}})A_k(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}})$ are continuous and linear (the second operator is additive because A_k and $\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}$ are additive, and homogeneous because A_k is homogeneous, and $\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}$ is anti-homogeneous and appears twice). Therefore, by comparison the results of the two chains of calculations above, and linearity and continuity argument we obtain $(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}})A_k(\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}) = A_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$. Thus, (ii) follows from (iii).

(ii)⇒(i). Let f satisfies (ii). Then $f \in \mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, and the operator-valued linear function $A(z)$ is $\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{H}}$-real, i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a(\bar{z}) & b(\bar{z}) \\ c(\bar{z}) & d(\bar{z}) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\mathcal{H}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z) \end{bmatrix}, \quad z \in \Omega_N.$$

The latter is equivalent to the identities

$$\begin{array}{ll} \iota_{\mathcal{U}} a(\bar{z}) \iota_{\mathcal{U}} = a(z), & \iota_{\mathcal{U}} b(\bar{z}) \iota_{\mathcal{H}} = b(z), \\ \iota_{\mathcal{H}} c(\bar{z}) \iota_{\mathcal{U}} = c(z) & \iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z}) \iota_{\mathcal{H}} = d(z), \end{array} \quad z \in \Omega_N.$$

Since $\iota_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = I_{\mathcal{H}}$, and

$$(\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})^{-1}\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \cdot (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) = (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \cdot (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})^{-1}\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) = I_{\mathcal{H}},$$

one has $\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})^{-1}\iota_{\mathcal{H}} = (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{H}})^{-1} = d(z)^{-1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f^\sharp(z) &= \iota_{\mathcal{U}} f(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}} = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}(a(\bar{z}) - b(\bar{z})d(\bar{z})^{-1}c(\bar{z}))\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= \iota_{\mathcal{U}} a(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}} - (\iota_{\mathcal{U}} b(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \cdot (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} d(\bar{z})^{-1}\iota_{\mathcal{H}}) \cdot (\iota_{\mathcal{H}} c(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}) \\ &= a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z) = f(z), \end{aligned}$$

i.e., f is $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real. Thus, (i) follows from (ii).

(iv)⇒(i). Let (iv) hold. Then the operator $U = U^* = U^{-1}$ is $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})$-real (and, by the way, $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})$-symmetric due to Lemma 6.2), i.e.,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{X}} & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\mathcal{U}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \iota_{\mathcal{X}} & 0 \\ 0 & \iota_{\mathcal{U}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}.$$

This is equivalent to the following identities:

$$\iota_{\mathcal{X}} A \iota_{\mathcal{X}} = A, \quad \iota_{\mathcal{X}} B \iota_{\mathcal{U}} = B, \quad \iota_{\mathcal{U}} C \iota_{\mathcal{X}} = C, \quad \iota_{\mathcal{U}} D \iota_{\mathcal{U}} = D.$$

Moreover, since $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$ commutes with $P_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$, one has $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(w))\iota_{\mathcal{X}} = I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(\bar{w})$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(w))^{-1}\iota_{\mathcal{X}} = (I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(\bar{w}))^{-1}$ (we already used an analogous argument above). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^\sharp(w) &= \iota_{\mathcal{U}} \mathcal{F}(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{U}} = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}[D + CP(\bar{w})(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(\bar{w}))^{-1}B]\iota_{\mathcal{U}} \\ &= D + CP(w)(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(w))^{-1}B = \mathcal{F}(w), \quad w \in \mathbb{D}^N, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\mathcal{F}$ is $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real. Applying the inverse double Cayley transform to $\mathcal{F}$, one can see that f is also $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real on Π^N, and hence, on Ω_N. Thus, (i) follows from (iv).

(iii)⇒(iv). Let f satisfy the identity (2.11) with holomorphic $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$-real PSD kernels $\Phi_k(z,\zeta),\ k = 1, \dots, N$, on $\Pi^N \times \Pi^N$. Arguing like in the proof of (iii)⇒(ii) above, we get Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{M}_k$, holomorphic $L(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{M}_k)$-valued functions φ_k on Π^N, such that $\Phi_k(z,\zeta) = \varphi_k(\zeta)^*\varphi_k(z),\ (z,\zeta) \in \Pi^N \times \Pi^N$, AUIs $\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ on $\mathcal{M}_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{M}} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}$ on $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{M}_k$, for which (6.4) holds, and hence $\iota_{\mathcal{M}}\varphi(z) = \varphi(\bar{z})\iota_{\mathcal{U}},\ z \in \Pi^N$. Following the proof of Theorem 4.2, we get consecutively: identities (3.9) and (4.4) with holomorphic PSD kernels $\Xi_k(w,\omega)$ such that $\Xi_k(w,\omega) = \xi_k(\omega)^*\xi_k(w),\ (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, and $\xi_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$, are given in (3.11), moreover $\iota_{\mathcal{M}}\xi(w) = \xi(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{U}},\ w \in \mathbb{D}^N$; then identities (4.5) and (4.9) with holomorphic PSD kernels $\Theta_k(w,\omega)$ such that $\Theta_k(w,\omega) = \theta_k(\omega)^*\theta_k(w),\ (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N$, and $\theta_k,\ k = 1, \dots, N$, are given in (4.8), moreover $\iota_{\mathcal{M}}\theta(w) = \theta(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{U}},\ w \in \mathbb{D}^N$; then identities (4.10) and (4.11) with holomorphic functions $\widetilde{\theta_k}(w) = \theta_k(\bar{w})^*,\ w \in \mathbb{D}^N$, taking values in $L(\mathcal{M}_k, \mathcal{U})$, moreover, $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\theta_k}(w) = \widetilde{\theta_k}(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k},\ w \in \mathbb{D}^N$. The latter equality is valid since for any $m \in \mathcal{M}_k,\ u \in \mathcal{U}$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\theta_k}(w)m, u\rangle &= \langle \iota_{\mathcal{U}}\theta_k(\bar{w})^*m, u\rangle = \langle \iota_{\mathcal{U}}u, \theta_k(\bar{w})^*m\rangle = \langle \theta_k(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{U}}u, m\rangle \\ = \langle \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}\theta_k(w)u, m\rangle &= \langle \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}m, \theta_k(w)u\rangle = \langle \theta_k(w)^*\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}m, u\rangle = \langle \widetilde{\theta_k}(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k}m, u\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\widetilde{\theta}(w) := [\ \widetilde{\theta}_1(w)\ \ \dots\ \ \widetilde{\theta_N}(w)\ ]$. Then $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\theta}(w) = \widetilde{\theta}(\bar{w})\iota_{\mathcal{M}},\ w \in \mathbb{D}^N$. For the reproducing kernels $K_k(w,\omega) = \widetilde{\theta}(w)\widetilde{\theta}(\omega)^*$ of the spaces $\mathcal{M}_k$ we get the identities $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}K_k(\bar{w},\bar{\omega})\iota_{\mathcal{U}} = K_k(w,\omega),\ (w,\omega) \in \mathbb{D}^N \times \mathbb{D}^N,\ k = 1,\dots,N$. Define in the space $\mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{D}(\widehat{K_k})$, where $\mathcal{D}(\widehat{K_k}),\ k = 1,\dots,N$, are Hilbert spaces with the reproducing kernels

$$\widehat{K_k}(w,\omega) = \left[\begin{array}{cc} K_k(w,\omega) & K_k(w,\omega) \\ K_k(w,\omega) & K_k(w,\omega) \end{array}\right],$$

the operator $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} := \bigoplus_{k=1}^N(\iota_{\mathcal{M}_k} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{M}_k})$. Then $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$ is an AUI on $\mathcal{X}$, and $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}P_k = P_k\iota_{\mathcal{X}},\ k = 1,\dots,N$. Moreover, it is easy to see that $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})U_0 = U_0(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})$, and therefore $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})\widetilde{U_0} = \widetilde{U_0}(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})$. It is clear that $\mathcal{D}_0$ is invariant under $\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}}$, as well as $\mathcal{D}_0^\perp = (\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{U}) \ominus \overline{\mathcal{D}_0}$ (in fact, since $\mathcal{D}_0 \supset \mathcal{U}$, one has $(\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{U}) \ominus \overline{\mathcal{D}_0} \subset \mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{D}_0^\perp$ is invariant under $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}$). Indeed, for any $h_1 \in \mathcal{D}_0,\ h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_0^\perp$ one has

$$\langle(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})h_2, h_1\rangle = \langle(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})h_1, h_2\rangle = 0,$$

since $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})h_1 \in \mathcal{D}_0$, thus $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})h_2 \in \mathcal{D}_0^\perp$. As $U = \widetilde{U}_0 \oplus I_{\mathcal{D}_0^\perp}$, we get $(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})U = U(\iota_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus \iota_{\mathcal{U}})$. So, we see that (iv) follows from (iii). The proof is complete. □

7. Conclusion and open problems

In this paper the class $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$, which was defined by M. F. Bessmertnyĭ in [9] (see also [10]) as a class of rational $n\times n$ matrix-valued functions having a long resolvent representation (1.1) with matrix coefficients $A_0 = 0,\ A_k = A_k^* = A_k^T \geq 0,\ k = 1,\dots,N$, in (1.2) (note, that matrices A_k have real entries), was generalized in several directions simultaneously. First, one can consider the class $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n} = \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ of rational $n\times n$ matrix-valued functions having a long resolvent representation (1.1) with matrix coefficients $A_0 = 0,\ A_k = A_k^* \geq 0,\ k = 1,\dots,N$, in (1.2) (i.e., entries of matrices A_k are complex, not necessarily real). Second, we have introduced the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, which is a generalization of $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$, consisting of holomorphic (not necessarily rational) functions on the open right polyhalfplane Π^N (and naturally extendable to the domain $\Omega_N = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\Pi)^N$) which take values in $L(\mathcal{U})$ for a (not necessarily finite-dimensional) Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$ and having representations of the form (1.1) with coefficients $A_0 = 0,\ A_k = A_k^* \geq 0,\ k = 1,\dots,N$, in (1.2), which are linear bounded operators on $\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, where a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is not supposed to be finite-dimensional. We have obtained several equivalent characterizations of the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, which we call the Bessmertnyĭ class, scattered in different parts of this paper, and for convenience of a reader we collect them now in the following theorem.

Theorem 7.1. *Let f be a holomorphic function on the domain $\Omega_N = \bigcup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{T}}(\lambda\Pi)^N \subset \mathbb{C}^N$ which takes values in $L(\mathcal{U})$ for a Hilbert space $\mathcal{U}$. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

(i): *There exist a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and a representation*

$$f(z) = a(z) - b(z)d(z)^{-1}c(z), \quad z \in \Omega_N,$$

of f, where

$$A(z) = z_1A_1 + \cdots + z_NA_N = \begin{bmatrix} a(z) & b(z) \\ c(z) & d(z) \end{bmatrix} \in L(\mathcal{U} \oplus \mathcal{H}),$$

with $A_k = A_k^* \geq 0,\ k = 1, \ldots, N$;

(ii): *there exists a representation*

$$f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{N} z_k \Phi_k(z, \zeta), \quad (z, \zeta) \in \Omega_N \times \Omega_N,$$

of f, where $\Phi_k(z, \zeta),\ k = 1, \ldots, N$, are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Omega_N \times \Omega_N$;

(iii): *f satisfies the conditions:*

1. $f(\lambda z_1, \ldots, \lambda z_N) = \lambda f(z_1, \ldots, z_N),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z \in \Omega_N$;
2. $f(\mathbf{R}) + f(\mathbf{R})^* \geq 0, \quad \mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$
   (the set $\mathcal{A}^N$ of N-tuples of commuting strictly accretive operators on a Hilbert space, and the functional calculus for $f(\mathbf{R})$ are defined in Section 3);
3. $f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^*, \quad z \in \Omega_N$;

(iv): *there exist Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{X}_N$, such that $\mathcal{X} = \bigoplus_{k=1}^N \mathcal{X}_k$, and an Agler representation*

$$\mathcal{F}(w) = D + CP(w)(I_{\mathcal{X}} - AP(w))^{-1}B,$$

of a double Cayley transform $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$ of f (which is defined by (4.1)), where $P(w) = \sum_{k=1}^N w_k P_{\mathcal{X}_k}$, and

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} = U = U^{-1} = U^* \in L(\mathcal{X} \oplus \mathcal{U}).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ can be defined as a class of functions f satisfying any (and hence, all) of conditions (i)–(iv) of Theorem 7.1.

We have introduced also the class $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ consisting of all ι-real functions from $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, for an anti-unitary involution $\iota = \iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ on $\mathcal{U}$. The operator ι plays a role analogous to the complex conjugation on $\mathbb{C}^N$, and the class $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ is a generalization of the class $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$. We have obtained several characterizations of the class $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, which are collected in Theorem 6.4.

Let us note that though several descriptions of the classes $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ were obtained in this paper, the investigation of these classes is still far from its final point. We formulate and discuss below the most important questions subject to further investigation.

Recall that the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$) is a subclass of $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$), where the latter is a class of all $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued functions holomorphic in Ω_N and satisfying the conditions:

1. $f(\lambda z_1, \dots, \lambda z_N) = \lambda f(z_1, \dots, z_N),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z \in \Omega_N$;
2. $f(z) + f(z)^* \geq 0, \quad z \in \Pi^N$;
3. $f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^* \quad (= f^\sharp(z) := \iota f(\bar{z})\iota), \quad z \in \Omega_N$.

Analogously, the class $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ (resp., $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$) is a subclass of $\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ (resp., $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$), where the latter is a class of all rational $n \times n$ matrix-valued functions satisfying the conditions:

1. $f(\lambda z_1, \dots, \lambda z_N) = \lambda f(z_1, \dots, z_N),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\},\ z \in \mathbb{C}^N$;
2. $f(z) + f(z)^* \geq 0, \quad z \in \Pi^N$;
3. $f(\bar{z}) = f(z)^* \quad (= f(\bar{z})^T), \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^N$.

It is known that in the cases $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ condition 2 for all of these classes is equivalent to condition (iii2) of Theorem 7.1, thus for these cases the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$) coincides with $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$).

Problem 1. For which $N \geq 3$, $\mathcal{U}$, $\iota_{\mathcal{U}}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the class $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$) is a proper subclass of $\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ (resp., $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$)?

For the classes $\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\iota\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N(\mathcal{U})$, $N \geq 3$, this problem, can be reformulated as follows: find $f \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ and $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{A}^N$ such that the selfadjoint operator $f(\mathbf{R}) + f(\mathbf{R})^*$ is not PSD. The latter is equivalent to the inequality $\|\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{T})\| > 1$, where $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$ is a holomorphic contractive $L(\mathcal{U})$-valued function on $\mathbb{D}^N$, and the N-tuple of operators $\mathbf{T} = (T_1, \dots, T_N) \in \mathcal{C}^N$ is defined by $T_k := (R_k - I)(R_k + I)^{-1},\ k = 1, \dots, N$, i.e. for $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathbf{T}$ the *generalized von Neumann inequality* fails. There are examples of holomorphic contractive operator-valued functions $\mathcal{F}$ and N-tuples $\mathbf{T}$ of commuting strict contractions on a Hilbert space, for which the generalized von Neumann inequality fails (see [22, 11, 13]), however in these examples the requirement $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{C}(f)$ for some $f \in \mathcal{P}_N(\mathcal{U})$ is not fulfilled. A function $\mathcal{F}$ satisfying this requirement must have a certain complicated structure induced by the homogeneity structure of f. Thus, more sophisticated examples should be found to meet this condition.

Another open problem concerns to characterization of classes $\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ and $\mathbb{R}\mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$ (the formulation below is given for the first of them).

Problem 2. Does the representation $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^N z_k \Phi_k(z, \zeta)$ of an arbitrary $f \in \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$, where $\Phi_k(z, \zeta),\ k = 1, \dots, N$, are rational $n \times n$ matrix-valued functions which are holomorphic PSD kernels on $\Omega_N \times \Omega_N,\ N \geq 3$, imply $f \in \mathcal{B}_N^{n\times n}$?

Let us formulate this more accurately.

Problem 3. For which $N \geq 3,\ n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $f \in \mathcal{P}_N^{n\times n}$ the question in Problem 2 has a positive answer?

References

[1] J. Agler. On the representation of certain holomorphic functions defined on a polydisc. In L. de Branges, I. Gohberg, and J. Rovnyak, editors, *Topics in Operator Theory: Ernst D. Hellinger Memorial Volume*, volume 48 of *Oper. Theory and Appl.*, pages 47–66. Birkhäuser-Verlag, Basel, 1990.

[2] J. Agler and J. McCarthy. Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation on the bidisk. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 506:191–204, 1999.

[3] N. I. Akhiezer and I. M. Glazman. *Theory of Linear Operators in Hilbert Space.* Nauka, Moscow, 1966. (Russian); English Transl.: Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1993, xiv+147+iv+218 pp.

[4] N. Aronszajn. Theory of reproducing kernels. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 68(3):337–404, 1950.

[5] J. A. Ball, W. S. Li, D. Timotin, and T. Trent. A commutant lifting theorem on the polydisc. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 48(2):653–675, 1999.

[6] J. A. Ball and T. Trent. Unitary colligations, reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, and Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation in several variables. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 157:1–61, 1998.

[7] M. F. Bessmertnyĭ. On realization of rational matrix functions of several variables. II. (to appear).

[8] M. F. Bessmertnyĭ. On realization of rational matrix functions of several variables. III. (to appear).

[9] M. F. Bessmertnyĭ. *Functions of Several Variables in the Theory of Finite Linear Structures.* Ph. D. Thesis, Kharkov University, Kharkov, 1982. (Russian).

[10] M. F. Bessmertnyĭ. On realization of rational matrix functions of several variables. *Oper. Theory: Adv. Appl.*, 134, 2002.

[11] M. Crabb and A. Davie. Von Neumann's inequality for Hilbert space operators. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 7:49–50, 1975.

[12] A. V. Efimov and V. P. Potapov. J-expanding matrix functions and their role in the analytical theory of electrical circuits. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 28(1):65–130, 1973. (Russian). English Transl.: Russ. Math. Surveys, 28:1 (1973), pp. 69–140.

[13] D. S. Kalyuzhniy. On the von Neumann inequality for linear matrix functions of several variables. *Mat. Zametki*, 64(2):218–223, August 1998. (Russian); English translation: Math. Notes **64** (1998), no. 2, 186–189.

[14] D. S. Kalyuzhniy. Multiparametric dissipative linear stationary dynamical scattering systems: Discrete case. *J. Operator Theory*, 43(2):427–460, 2000.

[15] D. S. Kalyuzhniy. Multiparametric dissipative linear stationary dynamical scattering systems: Discrete case, II: Existence of conservative dilations. *Integral Equations Operator Theory*, 36(1):107–120, 2000.

[16] Sh. Karni. *Network Theory: Analysis and Synthesis.* Allyn and Bacon Series in Electrical Engineering. Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1966.

[17] M. S. Livšic and M. Š. Flekser. The synthesis of a transmission line from given frequency characteristics. *Zap. Meh.-Mat. Fak. i Har'kov. Mat. Obšč.*, 28(4):149–162, 1961. (Russian).

[18] L. Schwartz. *Analyse Mathématique*, volume II. Hermann, Paris, 1967. xxiv+475+21+75 pp.

[19] S. Seshu and M. B. Reed. *Linear Graphs and Electrical Networks*. Addison-Wesley Series in the Engineering Sciences. Electrical and Control Systems. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1961. x+315 p.

[20] B. V. Shabat. *Introduction to Complex Analysis. Part I. Functions of a Single Variable*. Nauka, Moscow, 1985. (Russian); French Transl.: Chabat, B. Introduction à l'analyse complexe. Tome 1. Fonctions d'une variable. Traduit du Russe: Mathématiques. Mir, Moscow, 1990. 309 pp.

[21] B. V. Shabat. *Introduction to Complex Analysis. Part II. Functions of Several Variables*. Nauka, Moscow, 1985. (Russian); French Transl.: Chabat, B. Introduction à l'analyse complexe. Tome 2. Fonctions de plusieurs variables. Traduit du Russe: Mathématiques. Mir, Moscow, 1990. 420 pp.; English Transl.: Translations of Mathematical Monographs, 110. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1992. x+371 pp.

[22] N. Varopoulos. On an inequality of von Neumann and an application of the metric theory of tensor products to operator theory. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 16:83–100, 1974.

Department of Mathematics, The Weizmann Institute, Rehovot 76100, Israel
E-mail address: `dmitryk@wisdom.weizmann.ac.il`